

Appendix

The Postmaster as a Community Leader— Address by Senator Byrd, of West Virginia, Before West Virginia Postmasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech which I made on July 29 before the West Virginia chapter, National Association of Postmasters, at Martinsburg, W. Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ADDRESS BY HON. ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE WEST VIRGINIA CHAPTER, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTMASTERS, MEETING AT MARTINSBURG, W. VA., JULY 29, 1961

The New England essayist, Ralph Waldo Emerson, once said, "Conversation is the laboratory and workshop of the student." This convention of West Virginia postmasters will no doubt prove the correctness of Mr. Emerson's contention. Gathering together to discuss your problems should not only lead to solutions, but also to further progress in the mail service of the State.

Americans have always taken pride in our mail service. From childhood up, each of us has come to understand that despite the vagaries of weather—rain, sleet, snow, or the burning sun on a humid day—the delivery of mail is a certainty. Few of us realize, however, what it takes, administratively, to give America the best mail service ever.

But every step that is taken to improve and strengthen the postal service, is also a step that serves to bolster the economy of the Nation. This is proven history.

Take, for example, the suggestion which the postal service made to the banking business several years ago—that the mails should be considered for the sending of checks for deposit to customers' accounts. Within the span of a few years, the volume of such check-deposit mail handled by the Nation's banks has placed this service in fifth position among the more than 20 services daily performed by banks.

Within the past 10 days the postal service has launched a new program under the title of "Nationwide Improved Mail Service." As you know, the largest mailers in each city have been given membership in the Citizens Advisory Council for Postal Operations. As a whole, these large mailers generate approximately 70 percent of our country's mail volume. By working with these citizen groups, it may be possible to help them plan for a rescheduling of the vast amount of mail they now deposit in the late afternoon—a flow which creates an evening peak-load of mail instead of a balanced flow during the entire course of the day.

Thus, this step—the creation of the Citizens Advisory Council—can only lead to a

better than ever mail service, and this of itself will prove to be a boon to the economy of the country.

But the role of the postmaster goes beyond that of seeking ways to speed the delivery of mail. He must also have an intimate concern with the problems of his community—the social ones as well as the economic ones—for as his community grows and prospers, so will his post office grow and prosper.

The economic potentials of West Virginia are nothing short of tremendous. For the most part these potentials are inherent in our many natural resources—resources which literally beg for development and exploitation. The development of these resources, however, calls for the imagination, the energy, and the resourcefulness of leaders in each and every one of our communities.

The postmaster, by his very position, is a leader in his community. He knows the shape and character of his community. He knows the human potentials of his community. It is logical, therefore, that he is also intimately aware of his community's social and economic needs, and perhaps has also given much thought to how improvements can be made in each direction.

This knowledgeable man, the postmaster—this man who has an encyclopedic store of community information—should be an active member of any local group of citizens concerned with community development. Moreover, he is an ideal man for such a group, because he has no ax to grind, no vested interest to be concerned with other than his vested interest in the growth and progress of his community. He can be an impartial arbiter of differences of opinion, a valued mentor whose thoughts would be respected.

Now that the Area Redevelopment Act is the law of the land, there is opportunity for every West Virginia community that has suffered economic decline to invigorate itself, to enrich itself with job opportunities through the attraction of new industries or the expansion of existing ones. Certainly, industry contemplating moving into a depressed community would be concerned with the kind of postal service that would be available. Here, then, would be an opportunity for a postmaster to secure the future of his community by pledging expeditious service—the kind of service that may require a bit of shuffling around of routes, a realignment of clerical help, and perhaps a rescheduling of working hours.

Tourism holds forth a great economic potential for West Virginia. There can be no denying the beauty and grandeur of our State. But there are other attractions which should interest outsiders and encourage them to visit with us. For example, in the very near future we are going to celebrate our 100th birthday as State, and we shall do this with numerous activities in many sections of the State. Here, then, is a proposition for this convention to consider:

In certain instances the Post Office Department permits the use of slogans with cancellation dies. Permission has been granted for the use of such slogans as "Keep Maine Green," and others dealing with historical events. Why not plan now, on a Statewide basis, to have a cancellation die slogan such as: "Help West Virginia celebrate her century of statehood in 1963." This kind of cancellation die slogan on every letter mailed

in West Virginia, could be very helpful in giving a solid spur to tourism in our State.

I firmly believe that the postmasters of West Virginia can help our people end the paradox of economic distress amid the vast natural wealth of our State. I believe this because the postmasters of West Virginia have always been a constructive force—a progressive force which wisely maintains a mutuality of interest with the people of their communities. As people dedicated to the service of other people, our postmasters always seem to extend themselves beyond the call of the postal service. They represent themselves not only as servants of the postal system, but also as servants of the entire U.S. Government.

They willingly post their office walls with notices and announcements from a vast number of Federal departments and agencies. Often, their walls are not large enough for the posting of everything that is sent them, but they do their best to get the better of such material pinned up for public perusal.

This very clutter of notices and announcements, however, often repels, rather than attracts, readers. Unfortunately, this may mean an unawareness of some important fact, or even a post-employment opportunity.

Take, for example, postings of civil service examination notices. Because of the excessively high rate of unemployment in our State, such notices of job opportunities are especially important to West Virginians. But if such notices are part of a clutter—as they most often are—they may not get read.

Here again, then, is an opportunity for the kind of community service that makes our postmasters outstanding citizens. A busy man always finds time for some additional work. In this instance, the additional work would be to advise local newspapers and radio stations of the civil service examination notices the moment they come to the office. You will find these news media more than anxious to make known, to the entire area that they cover, the Federal job opportunities that are available.

The good people that Uncle Sam wants for Federal employment may be your post office customers. Certainly, they could be members of your community. Thus, you may be performing a doubly good deed by widely publicizing Federal job opportunities—helping someone find useful employment, while helping the Government obtain the best possible employable persons.

Today, the U.S. postal service is the biggest mail service in the world. Although our country occupies only one-fiftieth of the land surface of the globe, the people of America send and receive nearly two-thirds of the total world's mail volume. Yet, we are not satisfied. We believe we should be sending even greater volumes of mail—intracity, intrastate, and interstate.

The free flow of mail—of correspondence—is a guarantee of freedom, for so long as we can freely communicate among ourselves, we shall fight to be a free people. For the expeditious and free flow of our mails, we have our postmasters to thank. And in thanking you, our West Virginia postmasters, I am mindful of what William Makepeace Thackeray once wrote: "Next to excellence is the appreciation of it."

The Delaware River Basin Compact**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. HERMAN TOLL**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to make a few comments on the proposed Delaware River Basin compact. I was very much pleased to see this body pass this vital piece of legislation, and it is my sincere hope that the Senate will do likewise. Pennsylvania, under the leadership of Governor Lawrence, has already taken the initiative by signing into law a State supported Delaware River Basin compact. The needs of this project, however, demand that the Federal Government lend its support. To have a program that is really effective and useful, we must pass this legislation into law.

The need for a Delaware River Basin compact has long been a need of the country, and I would like to enumerate a few of the major reasons to illustrate why this legislation is so important. Basically, Federal enactment of this bill would provide for a Commission that would make comprehensive plans for immediate and long range development of ways of using the resources of the Delaware. The Commission would make plans for navigation, electric power, conservation, dam building, and the maintaining of high quality drinking water. Philadelphia Water Commissioner Samuel Baxter said in an article that appeared in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* on July 7, 1961:

If proper dams are built (Philadelphia) has an adequate supply of fresh, natural water for as far ahead as engineers have planned: the year 2010.

With increasing water shortages occurring all over the country, the statement of Mr. Baxter certainly shows the merit of this piece of legislation.

First of all, the Delaware River Basin compact would have an important influence in the vital area of flood protection. Flood damage caused by these waters resulted in over \$100 million worth of damage to homes, farms, factories, and communities on the flood plains, and the loss of over 90 lives in 1955. The lack of flow regulation on the Delaware also permits huge quantities of excess waters to go unused to the sea. This has resulted, during droughts, in serious water shortages. The sound policy of a Federal Commission in this field could well prevent more disastrous flood damage. In recent years the North, especially the Middle Atlantic States, has had to spend millions and millions of dollars as a result of floods caused by hurricanes. There is no reason to believe that these storms will not continue to rain destruction upon thousands of people. Surely, it would be more sensible to guide these funds in the direction of worthwhile preventive measures.

Second, the Delaware River Basin compact would have an important func-

tion in public recreation. Water related recreation sports would provide for the first time to millions of youngsters the opportunity of enjoying healthful, body building sports. Recent studies conducted indicate that the recreation demands of the people of the Delaware service area will be more than 6½ times the present level by the year 2010. In addition these studies show that State park facilities were being used at only one-third of their designed capacity in the year 1955. In an age when population is expanding in the United States at a fantastic pace—1,446,443 since January 20, 1961—we must provide the facilities to get the young people off the streets. With the rise in juvenile delinquency causing great alarm to us all, it is imperative that we make use of the means to alleviate this situation.

Thirdly, the Delaware River Basin compact would have the important function of dealing in the development of hydroelectric power and energy. The requirements of the Delaware River have increased rapidly in the past years. Still more important, the demands of the future will require the Delaware River Basin to provide much larger amounts of electric energy than it is presently doing. Figures show that the utility peak demands of the area will increase to a total of 34 million kilowatts by 1980 and to about 96 million kilowatts by 2010. Our country must constantly be looking to the future to stay abreast of the times. In other words, we must develop to the fullest extent all of our natural resources. We are fortunate enough to be blessed with great quantities of wealth; we must make full use of them.

Fourthly, we are constantly reading of the great perils of pollution to our rivers and streams. At present the waters that make up the Delaware River Basin are of excellent quality. However, the growth of population and industry will seriously endanger this present condition. Programs are needed to furnish data for future use in water-quality prediction. Sufficient treatment plants would remove the anticipated additional loads by increasing the efficiency of present levels of waste removal to the higher degrees that are technically possible.

As you can see, the needs for such a program are many. I like to think of this project as one giant conservation program that will save this country many millions of dollars in the future. Though the initial outlay will be heavy upon our Government, we cannot wait, with population expanding the way it is, until serious shortages and other problems engulf us. Though this program deals essentially with only one area of the country, it is in no sense a local project. The resources of the Delaware River Basin contribute to the social and economic well-being of over 21 million people which certainly makes up a large percentage of our population. The need for a Federal program will satisfy not only present needs, but the staggering demands of the future. During this period both population and employment will double. It now remains for the Congress of the United States to meet this problem.

School Bill Means 250,000 Jobs**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF****HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we have heard many arguments within recent months about the need for Federal aid to education. Usually, we limit our discussion to the needs of the Nation, of students, of teachers, and our technology. Within recent days, however, the distinguished columnist, Sylvia Porter, has described still another factor in the school aid issue. In her column of July 28, she points out that our national economy would enjoy "a great and lasting boost" if we vigorously act to meet present and future school construction needs. She quotes from a Bureau of Labor Statistics studies to show that the approximately 250,000 full-time jobs for men and women each year would be created if we do the job that we know must be done.

Mrs. Porter is not arguing politics. As she makes clear, she is writing as a reporter on economics and finance. Her arguments should certainly be considered as we make our decisions on school aid.

Mr. President, I ask consent to have Mrs. Porter's column, entitled "School Aid Bill OK Means 250,000 Jobs," inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

- [From the Courier Post, July 28, 1961]
- SCHOOL AID BILL OK MEANS 250,000 JOBS
- (By Sylvia Porter)

Battered by bitter racial-religious controversy, caught in emotional crossfires in both parties and in the White House itself, the Kennedy administration's school aid bill at this point seems doomed. "Only a miracle can save it," is the realistic judgment of an astute Washington source, and he adds, "The odds against this miracle are 75-25."

This being a realistic judgment, I'll not snipe at it, and certainly, in my role as a reporter on the economic-financial aspects of the news, I haven't the privilege of commenting on racial and religious controversy or emotional crossfires.

But as a reporter in the sphere of economics and finance, I do have the privilege of emphasizing that if a miracle were to occur, it would give our entire economy a great and lasting boost. The construction of a school doesn't mean just classrooms for kids. It means jobs for those involved directly and indirectly in building the schools, profits for employers in hundreds of industries and trades.

More specifically, the school aid bill could create up to 250,000 full-time jobs for men and women each year in coming years.

It could provide 100,000 jobs a year on the school construction sites, far more than 100,000 jobs a year off the sites.

It could create hundreds of thousands of jobs on top of these in the production of equipment going into the schools and among those benefiting from the spending of the paychecks and profits.

None of this is guesswork. By coincidence, this week the Bureau of Labor Statistics

tics released the first in a series of pioneering studies authorized by the 86th Congress to "determine the labor requirements of various types of construction that might be affected by Government action," and this initial study is on school construction.

School construction was selected for the first study for two reasons, according to James F. Walker, the BLS expert supervising all the surveys. The first reason is that public school construction already is so big, running over \$2.5 billion a year and accounting for one-sixth of total public construction outlays. The second reason is that the need for new classroom space is indisputable—the U.S. Office of Education estimates that in the next 5 years alone, more than 427,000 new classrooms will be needed.

What does this study show? This:

Each \$1,000 of elementary, junior, and senior high school construction results in 212 man-hours of employment.

Of these 212 man-hours, 84 hours are required for construction on the school site and 128 man-hours are required for offsite activities to produce and deliver the materials and equipment used in the construction of the school.

Since the cost of the average school in 1959 was \$730,000—not including site and planning costs—and since each school took about a year to build, this construction created a year's employment for 81 workers—38 in direct construction and 43 in various other activities indirectly required.

Since school construction is running at \$2.5 billion a year, this indicates that school building right now is the source of 275,000 jobs a year—115,000 onsite and 160,000 off-site—with manufacturing benefiting almost as much as school construction.

This, mind you, does not include the man-hours required to install utilities, prepare and landscape the school site. It does not include the man-hours required to produce the schools' furnishings.

It does not include the employment created by the responding of the wages and profits of the workers and their employers—"the multiplier effect" which Walker properly stresses as of major significance.

If a miracle occurs, we'll get this aid to employment—and that we need to spur employment is undeniable. And, of course, I've not even mentioned that while the men get the jobs they'll also be creating the schools in which our youngsters can learn how to survive and triumph.

Why I Will Vote Against House Concurrent Resolution 351

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 24, 1961

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 351 is scheduled to be considered first under suspension on the floor of the House next Monday, August 7.

I will vote against House Concurrent Resolution 351. A reasoned conviction compelled me to this decision, which was arrived at only after long and careful study of the language of that resolution in the light of President Kennedy's reply to the Russian demands on Berlin and his forthright address to the American people on July 25. It is not an easy

decision to take a stand which may set one Member apart from his colleagues on an issue of this magnitude.

I will vote against House Concurrent Resolution 351 for the following reasons:

I am convinced beyond doubt that its language is inconsistent with the political objectives outlined by President Kennedy on the third Berlin crisis. President Kennedy has called for a change in the present unnatural situation with respect to Berlin and a partitioned Germany. That is, a change for the better based upon the freely expressed will of the German people. House Concurrent Resolution 351 does nothing more than call for a maintenance of a status quo on Berlin. That is, support for the partition of Germany which makes it convenient for the Russians to provoke a crisis in Berlin at times and under circumstances of their choosing. No expression of Congress should avoid the basic issue of a free and united Germany.

House Concurrent Resolution 351 will accomplish nothing more than is already known to and accepted by every American—that we will not stand by while the Russians extinguish the flame of freedom which burns in free Berlin. In my view Congress should not be used as a forum for telling the American people or any other people something they already know.

The Berlin crisis is primarily a political problem and secondarily a military problem. It is a political problem first because the people in East Berlin and in the Russian zone of military occupation have been denied the right of self-determination. The Russian autocrats have denied 17 million German people this universally accepted political principle and have imposed upon them an alien regime which lacks popular support and serves no interest but those of the leaders in the Kremlin. Unless we resolve that political problem we will be faced with recurring military crises on Berlin. President Kennedy has proposed that the political problem be resolved so that the military threat to the peace will be removed. The formula proposed by President Kennedy for resolving the political problem, is application of the principle of self-determination to the 17 million people in East Germany. House Concurrent Resolution 351 turns its back on this political problem and denies the solution thereto proposed by President Kennedy. Moreover it restricts our position to a defense of our legal rights to be in Berlin. I oppose such restrictions because it would tend to tie the hands of our President in his courageous efforts to bring a peaceful solution to the basic political problem resulting from the unnatural partition of Germany.

For all too long Presidents of the United States have been roundly criticized for advocating policies which are no more than reactions to Russian initiative. President Truman and President Eisenhower received more than their fair share of such criticism. Up until a few days ago President Kennedy was the target of criticism calling for positive, affirmative action to meet the worldwide challenge of imperial Russian commun-

ism. But his meaningful reply to the Russian aide memoire on Berlin and his stirring call for a positive solution to the problem of Germany has stilled, at least temporarily, those voices of criticism. The language of House Concurrent Resolution 351 provides no support to President Kennedy in the political initiative which he has taken. It advocates no more than maintaining the present unnatural situation with respect to Berlin and a partitioned Germany. Congress should not put itself on record as opposing change for the better in that situation of perpetual crises. My vote against House Concurrent Resolution 351 will put me on record as favoring change for the better and as an opponent of status quo.

Mr. Tijerina's Schools Break the Language Barrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an article in the July issue of the Coronet magazine recites the stirring achievements of Mr. Felix Tijerina, of Houston, Tex., and the League of United Latin American Citizens in the field of education.

The article entitled "Now Juanito Can Read," tells how Mr. Tijerina became interested in the problems of Latin American children in Texas who often started to school without knowing enough English to prevent their being severely handicapped.

Mr. Tijerina, a distinguished businessman, reacted with a plan for helping prepare these children. This plan is attracting national attention because of its success and its great potential for good.

The Houston Press, June 21, 1961, printed another article concerning Mr. Tijerina's laudable venture into the field of education. I also wish to call attention to this article, entitled, "Little Schools of 400 May Spread to Far West."

Mr. Tijerina and the League of United Latin American Citizens and all others who have assisted in this extremely worth while undertaking deserve the respect, gratitude and commendation of all who stand for the best in education. They are providing the way for thousands of youngsters to break the language barrier, in a pioneering preschool education program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the record the article "Now Juanito Can Read" from Coronet magazine, the July issue, and also an article entitled "Little Schools of 400 May Spread to Far West" from the Houston Press of June 21, 1961:

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Coronet magazine, July 1961]
NOW JUANITO CAN READ—FELIX TJERINA, FIELD HAND TURNED TYCOON, IS GIVING MEXICAN-AMERICAN KIDS IN TEXAS THE PRECIOUS GIFT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE

(By Keith Elliott)

A pretty little girl with grave brown eyes held up her hand in a Ganado, Tex., classroom one hot, dusty day in 1946. It was Isabel Verber's first day in school. Shyly she spoke up: "Quiero, por favor, poquita agua." (I wish, please, a little water.)

The teacher, who spoke only English, ignored Isabel's request. At recess the child ran home in tears. Next day she returned to school, but she never forgot the frustration of her first day there. Instead of ranting, however, the memory of her despair grew into a determination to break the language barrier that has handicapped millions of Mexican-Americans in the southwest.

Ten years later, destiny brought the girl, now grown to womanhood and aspiring to be a teacher herself, together with the very man who could help her. Stubby, mustached Felix Tijerina, 56, was an energetic Houston businessman of Mexican parentage noted for his philanthropies. Isabel told him about the glass of water and the tears, and the telling took him back to the days before he had a Cadillac and a private plane and a chain of prospering restaurants—days when he picked cotton all day in the hot sun for 25 cents and couldn't say, either, "I wish, please, a little water."

Isabel told him, too, how some 50,000 Mexican-American youngsters reached school age each year without knowing a word of the English required in class; how 80 percent had to repeat the first year, and many soon dropped out altogether, mainly because of the language barrier. She mentioned the University of Texas study that showed native-born Mexican-Americans in Texas averaged only 3½ years of schooling.

"Isn't it a dreadful thing that our people's children still suffer because their parents speak only Spanish?" she lamented. "If only we could teach them English before they start school."

"Well, let's do it," Tijerina said impulsively.

The problem was, and still is, immense. The League of United Latin-American Citizens (LULAC) estimates that there are 10 million Spanish-speaking people in the continental United States, and 8 million of them are Mexican-Americans. The language barrier, LULAC officials have long agreed, is the biggest obstacle separating these Latin-American citizens of the United States from total acceptance and understanding. But in a matter of weeks the indefatigable Tijerina had launched a campaign that got to the heart of the problem, bringing new hope to millions of his people in the Southwest.

Felix knew that Mrs. Elizabeth Parris Burrus, veteran teacher at Baytown, Tex., had enjoyed singular success in teaching Mexican-American first graders. Tijerina went to see her and asked her secret.

It was fairly simple, the teacher replied. Most first-grade situations, she had learned in 20 years' experience, required just 400 words. Working slowly with these meaningful words helped Spanish-speaking youngsters make the transition into English. At Tijerina's request Mrs. Burrus drew up a list of her 400 "magic" words. Felix had the vocabulary printed in booklet form.

Then, with his own money, Felix established two tuition-free summer classes of 6 weeks which he called "Little Schools of the 400." Aided by the local LULAC, he enrolled 42 preschoolers who spoke only Spanish. In church-room classes at Ganado and Edna, near Houston, the wide-eyed children were exposed to English for the first time in 1957. The first teacher: Isabel Verber, whose childhood thirst and rejection had started it all.

Felix visited the classes constantly. Patiently, he helped teachers correct basic pronunciation faults. "Don't say jue," he would explain, "say you." Or, "It's mouth, not mouse, Juanito.") Finally, the 42 children were ready for the acid test. They entered elementary school.

And caramba. All of them passed the first grade. The year before, over half the Mexican-American first graders at Edna and Ganado had failed to pass first-grade work. Isabel was ecstatic. "We've won," she said proudly.

Felix said: "We've just begun."

Such was the beginning of the "little schools," of which Texas Gov. Price Daniel has said: "No other program has offered such hope for the Latin-American children of Texas. And it is all due to the work and faith of one man."

Felix Tijerina explains his work and faith simply: "A man does not wish just to take from his community. He must give, as well." What Felix has taken from Texas he has worked hard for. Until he was 14 he spoke only Spanish. His father died when Felix was 10, leaving the boy to care for his mother and three sisters. For 4 years he toiled as a field hand in the cotton and fruit farms around his native Sugarland. At 14, he landed a job as a bus boy in a Houston cafe. One day his bilingual employer gave him some good advice: "You wish to get ahead? Then speak as others speak. Learn English." Six months in a public night school followed, the only formal schooling Tijerina ever had.

Over the years, Felix has acquired the ability to speak and write flawless English. He has also acquired wealth. "It is simple to make money," he insists. "One merely finds a hunger and satisfies it."

The hunger that built the Tijerina fortune was for Mexican food. Starting with a one-man diner in 1929, the business has grown to a chain of thriving restaurants in Houston and Beaumont, and includes prospering real estate and banking interests.

True to his philosophy, Felix has given providently from the first. He has been a director of Rotary, twice chairman of the Houston Housing Authority and national president of LULAC. Hospitals, youth organizations and the Houston Opera are only a few of the causes that have known his financial backing and tireless campaigning. But the gift he most likes to give is education.

"I couldn't guess how many students have attended college with grants from the boss," says Antonio Campos, Felix's assistant and longtime friend. "Some men are compulsive gamblers or drinkers. Felix is a compulsive educator."

Once Felix lent a young Mexican-American \$750 to enter medical school. Ten years later the loan was repaid. Felix laughed. "I had forgotten all about that loan," he said.

"Is that good business?" his assistant wondered.

"I think so," Felix replied. "I might have doubled my money by investing it. But this way, I've still got the money, and I've given the world a doctor. Isn't that a nice dividend?"

But nothing he had ever done was to pay such dividends, both in personal satisfactions and public good, as the "little schools of the 400." Tijerina plunged into the work with characteristic energy.

During 6 months following the Ganado-Edna success, Tijerina opened seven more schools near Houston. Felix poured out thousands of his own money for materials, salaries, and advertising the program among Mexican-American parents; he obtained LULAC's support for funds and recruiting preschool children. By the spring of 1959, the nine schools had taught basic English to more than 1,000 children. Less than 5 percent of them failed on entering formal

school. Armed with statistics, Felix now moved for statewide support of his program. Austin, the State capital, became headquarters for his most telling assault on the language barrier.

He visited his old friend, Governor Daniel. Glowingly, he reviewed the success of the nine little schools, won the Governor's personal support for additional little schools. Felix registered as a lobbyist. He talked with legislators, senators and educators, imploring their help. Representative Malcolm McGregor of El Paso agreed to sponsor a bill to set up State-financed little schools throughout Texas. House Speaker Waggoner Carr went with Felix to see preschool English classes in action. Deeply moved by what he saw, he promised to help get McGregor's measure passed.

Finally the legislature met to consider dozens of school appropriations. Felix watched tensely as frugal representatives turned down recommendations one by one. Texas was facing severe budget problems, and Felix's hopes for a revolutionary new program seemed dim.

But when the McGregor bill came up for a vote, it carried without difficulty. The little restaurateur's friendly persuasion had paid off. The Texas Education Agency now had \$1,300,000 with which to establish Tijerina-styled little schools throughout Texas.

Felix addressed the State senate after the bill was passed. For once he was at a loss for words in any tongue. Near tears, he said simply: "Thank you, gentlemen, for what you have done. May God bless you."

There was still work to be done. As administrators began hiring teachers for the initial State-supported little schools in 130 school districts, Felix was faced with an ironical problem. He now had to convince Mexican-American parents all over the vast State that here lay hope for their children.

It was a tremendous job, often a frustrating one. Many Spanish-speaking parents were reluctant to abandon their own lingual heritage. Others simply didn't know about the new program.

Felix discussed the problem with his friend Madison Farnsworth, a former executive with the Gulf Oil Corp. "I want only one thing for my people," he explained. "To erase forever the phrase, no hablo Ingles—I don't speak English—from their children's tongues."

"I have an idea," said Farnsworth. "If it works out, I'll be in touch with you."

The oil man telephoned a few days later. "Would \$15,000 and a company airplane help you tell your story, Felix?"

"Will a chile burn your tongue?" said Felix gleefully. "Of course it will help. It should finish the job."

Now Felix, the LULAC, Gulf's publicity and advertising people, the Boy Scouts and scores of volunteers rallied to recruit students for the little schools. Leaflets were dropped from the Gulf plane. Appeals were broadcast in Spanish over 38 radio stations. TV studios ran a documentary film explaining the new program. Newspapers headlined the good word. Scouts carried handbills to remote Mexican-American settlements.

When State-sponsored little schools opened officially last summer, the language legions had reached more than 15,000 children in 81 Texas counties. Specially trained teachers, all bilingual, used stuffed toys, records, picture books and films to make the 400 basic "Anglo" words more graphic to youngsters. With patience and understanding they proved that "English can be fun."

Though Felix Tijerina is justifiably proud, he regards this as just a start. Next summer he hopes to see twice as many Mexican-American children taking preschool English courses in Texas. Felix has also talked with educators in other States with heavy Latin-American populations—New Mexico,

Arizona and California—in the hope of establishing other little schools where they are especially needed. He has addressed groups in Oklahoma, Iowa and Illinois, where migrant Mexican-Americans and their children go to harvest crops during the months when they might be learning preschool English; Felix's hope is to establish migrant little schools eventually for these people.

Meanwhile, through LULAC, pilot little schools are already operating at Elizabeth, N.J.; Santa Fe and Los Alamos, N. Mex.; and Santa Ana, Calif.; and at least one is being developed for New York City, to accommodate Puerto Rican preschoolers.

The walls of Tijerina's office are lined with civic accolades. Not long ago George Carmack of the Houston Press wrote: "If I had to name what I consider the best single civic program in this entire area, I think I would name the program that Felix Tijerina and his fellow LULAC's have set up to teach Latin American children English before they start school."

But little Victoria Vasquez voiced the tribute Felix treasures most. A fourth grader, she had been one of the first students in a little school of the 400. Proudly, she displayed a medal she had won in church for Bible interpretation. "I had to explain the story of the good Samaritan," she said.

"And how did you explain it?" Felix asked.

Victoria blushed. "I said the good Samaritan was a man like you."

[From the Houston Press, June 21, 1961]
LITTLE SCHOOLS OF 400 MAY SPREAD TO FAR WEST

If any man can say he has created something meaningful, that man is Felix Tijerina.

In the July issue of Coronet magazine is the story of Mr. Tijerina and his project of teaching Mexican-American children fundamental English.

But were it not for his initiative, interest and love of children, thousands of these youngsters would have difficulty in effectively communicating in English when they start their studies in American schools.

LANGUAGE BARRIER

Except among their own, they would be shut out. The answer lay in teaching the children basic English before they began first grade.

For if they entered school with the meager English they had simply picked up, they would surely fail, Mr. Tijerina reasoned. They would be unable to learn easily from an English-speaking teacher.

Mr. Tijerina decided to do something about this. With his own funds, he established tuition-free summer classes of 6 weeks, which he called "Little Schools of the 400"—because the children are taught 400 basic English words.

Aided by the League of United Latin-American Citizens, the schools flourished. According to "Papa Felix" there are more than 15,600 children studying in his classes this summer, all over the Southwest.

HIS THEME

Felix, 56, may become better known for his work in teaching children English than he is for the Mexican cuisine in his well-known restaurants.

He said:

"There are 35,000 children in Texas alone who cannot speak English. Unless they learn, they will never be able to begin school in this country."

"It's a wonderful, gratifying accomplishment to know that out of my 600 children in the Houston area, only six did not pass first grade this year. Before, more than 75 percent had to repeat the first grade and they usually failed again."

"We have proven that we can help the children. Now we can get help from the State legislatures."

He continued:

"The people of Harris County made this possible here. On the 28th I am going on to the Phoenix, Ariz., Board of Education and then to New Mexico to explain how we succeeded. I hope they will adopt our ideas and use them in their own school systems."

PRAISED BY GOVERNOR

Felix smiled proudly as he described the action of Gov. Price Daniel in signing the bill at Austin, which incorporated his plan into many Texas schools,

Said Governor Daniel:

"No other program has offered such hope for the Latin-American children of Texas. And it is all due to the work and faith of one man."

The Nature of the Struggle We Face

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members an editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune which discusses the true nature of the struggle in which we are engaged with the Communists. As this editorial so ably points out, the war between the Communists and the free world, cold or hot, will be a long one and our program to win it should be more far reaching than merely reacting to every emergency, each new crisis, every Communist inspired threat designed to throw us into a panic.

The editorial follows:

THE TWILIGHT STRUGGLE

President Kennedy has dealt with Berlin in terms of urgency and crisis, and his countrymen, having heard much talk from Khrushchev couched in similar tone, have taken him at his word. Congress is hurriedly responding to the President's call for more men, more arms, and more money.

There has been little popular disposition to question the President's assumptions that the test is imminent and that preparations must be made in haste. The recent bombast from Moscow would seem to bear out Mr. Kennedy's interpretation. But as soon as the President has delivered his appeal and measures are undertaken to meet his prescription, the Soviet reaction is that the people of the United States have given themselves over to war hysteria.

There may be a Berlin crisis in the making. It would be imprudent to say that Mr. Kennedy has reacted in an exaggerated way. Yet we now are beginning to hear that no informed person in Washington really believes that there is going to be a war. The casual attitude of our allies in Europe certainly does not suggest that this thought is entertained for even a moment.

Nor does the behavior of Mr. Kennedy and his lieutenants reflect any conviction that the Nation is now girding itself for Armageddon. Even while authorizations are being ground out to call up another 217,000 men, to mark bomb shelters and put warning devices in every home, and to spend an additional \$3,454 million on military and civil defense, the administration proceeds simultaneously with a program of Government as usual.

Even in his message alerting the people to "a worldwide threat," Mr. Kennedy refers to our total responsibilities in a variety of other directions, most of them tiresomely familiar—foreign aid to backward countries, Federal aid to education, and so on. When Mr. Kennedy said that we "can afford all these efforts," and coupled that with the statement that we must not allow foreign threats "to disrupt or slow down our economy," he was voicing his accustomed prejudices in favor of big Government, big spending, and the welfare state.

And when Republicans in Congress started to challenge the administration to match some of the sacrifices it was calling upon the people to make, the response of administration spokesmen was cold. There was no readiness to abandon any project afoot or in prospect, or to abandon any nonessential spending and to retrench.

Senator MANSFIELD, the majority leader, said that such things as the housing and education bills are needed to promote "a strong economy to hold up our foreign policy and strengthen our defense posture." The reasoning does not track. If the Nation actually is in a crisis and is being driven toward ever greater deficits, then, surely, these things are both irrelevant and superfluous. How deficits do anything but promote inflation and weaken the economy upon which defense and all else rest is a mystery to anyone but Senator MANSFIELD and his associated spenders.

Indeed, the administration seeks to persuade the people that it is just as imperative to fight Khrushchev with half a billion for combating stream pollution and half a dozen billions to provide public housing for families whose incomes exceed \$8,000 a year as it is to station men and arms to meet the shock of coming attack.

We submit that this outlook makes no sense. If the emergency is real, it requires Spartan measures by the politicians as well as by the people. Yet the politicians proceed as if the money barrel has no bottom and the durability of the taxpayer no limit, and as if the welfare State can exist while the garrison is facing siege.

So all this calls into some question both Mr. Kennedy's sincerity and Khrushchev's intentions. We know this much about each of them: It is Mr. Kennedy's habit to react to everything in terms of urgency. And it is Khrushchev's studious design to do everything possible to keep America off balance and to disorganize and demoralize it until it is ripe for conquest or psychologically prepared for surrender.

The Kennedy administration's contribution to disorganization is not inconsiderable. When everything is of equal importance—defense and farm subsidies, and free medical care, and the Peace Corps, and shooting a man to the moon—then it is hardly surprising that the impression develops that nothing is of too great importance.

And Khrushchev can promote the process of disorganization and frantic scurrying in every direction by merely turning on the propaganda. He can as easily turn it off. It must be remembered that his first threat to alter the status of Berlin was made in November 1958, 32 months ago.

Mr. Kennedy, in his inaugural address last January, summoned the American people to "a long twilight struggle, year in and year out," which would not be finished in 100 days, 1,000 days, in the life of his administration, "nor even perhaps in our lifetime on this planet." This, we think, placed the contest in truer perspective than it stands now, amid the beating of the administration's distracting tocsins.

If it is such a struggle we face, let us have more light and less twilight from the New Frontier mentality. Let us put things in order, husband our resources, and our

strength, and remain calm. Let us subordinate the extraneous and unnecessary things so that we may save to pay the costs of this protracted test. Let us stop being deluded by the gospel that the way to strengthen the economy upon which our defense rests is to sap the same economy continually. And let us, as responsible citizens, cease responding with a conditioned reflex every time someone in Washington or Moscow chooses to ring the panic bell.

Long-Term Budget Planning

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES**

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. David Bell, recently testified before the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. His testimony related to the long-term budget planning of the administration.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. David Bell be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DAVID E. BELL, DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am very glad to appear before you today. The series of impressive reports which came from the hearings conducted by this subcommittee last year has been of considerable interest to those of us concerned with establishing the pattern of management and operation of the new administration. We will look forward with interest to any report that may come from your present hearings.

You have asked me to discuss with you the role of the budgetary process in national security policymaking and execution, particularly as it appears from the viewpoint of the Bureau of the Budget. I should like to place before you three or four ideas which seem relevant to your inquiry, and then I shall be glad to respond to any questions you may have.

Let me begin with two preliminary observations.

First, let me remind you very briefly of the basic origin and meaning of the Federal budget system. Speaking broadly, the Federal budget as we know it today is the product of a statute enacted by the Congress 40 years ago at the crest of a movement to reform obsolete fiscal procedures. The Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 included two major reforms which remain the basic foundations of the system today: one was the requirement that only the President (not his Cabinet officers or agency heads) may transmit a request for funds to the Congress; the other was the requirement that the President must transmit annually to the Congress a complete budget, showing all his proposals for spending and for raising the funds to support that spending.

These two reforms were of great significance. They gave to the President—and give him today—a major means for unifying and setting forth an overall executive branch program. And they give him a major responsibility for evolving a Federal budget that reflects his judgment of the relative priority of different Federal activities. Thus, the

President's budget necessarily reflects his policy judgments, and the Congress in acting on the President's budget necessarily reviews those policy judgments as to the relative importance of alternative uses of national resources.

Thus, the essential idea of the budget process is to permit a systematic consideration of our Government's program requirements in the light of available resources; to identify marginal choices and the judgment factors that bear upon them; to balance competing requirements against each other; and, finally, to enable the President to decide upon priorities and present them to the Congress in the form of a coherent work program and financial plan. It operates as an extremely effective element of discipline on the President and the executive branch because it requires that each proposed use of resources—for defense, science, natural resources, or whatever—be tested against others and against the total size of the budget.

In passing, I might add that it seems to me the Congress, because it considers budgetary matters for the most part in fragmented form, does not face quite the same necessity to consider the effect of separate budgetary actions in relation to each other and to the entire budget. The Congress might well seek methods that would assist a more sharply focused consideration of such matters.

My second preliminary observation is that budgeting for national security is a most complex matter, because the national security itself involves so many factors. Our security plainly depends in large part on our own military strength—and planning and budgeting for military strength is difficult in a time of rapid changes in weapons technology. But, in addition to our own military strength, our national security depends in part on the military capability of our allies, which requires combined international planning, and, where military assistance is involved, our budgeting process must consider the relative importance of our direct military outlays with indirect outlays through military aid. Over and above military outlays, budgeting for national security requires us to consider the addition to our security that may be made by contributing to the economic and social development of other countries through foreign aid. And, finally, budgeting for national security requires us to consider the underlying strength of our national economy—the requirements of economic stability and growth, and of the skills, education, and morale of our people.

It is plain that considering the national security in this broad sense requires the President (and the Congress) to make a difficult series of choices, for which we do not have a satisfactory set of criteria. How do we weigh the value, for example, in terms of our national security, of a marginal outlay for military force as against a marginal outlay for basic scientific research, or for strengthening higher education? Difficult as such questions may be, they are real choices; they affect our national security in a true sense; and we have to make them as best we can.

Against the background of these conceptions of the budget process, I should like to suggest three lines of improvement in our budgeting for national security.

The first is to make sure that budgeting and planning are in step. Logically, budgeting and planning are two sides of the same coin, two aspects of the same process. A budget is the financial expression of a plan. However, on some occasions in the past, it has been possible for budgets and plans to be established on different bases: that is, there might be an approved plan to have certain forces in being, and simultaneously a budget providing for a different level of forces.

We intend in this administration to make sure that we plan to do only what we are

willing to budget for—and to budget fully for what we plan. To accomplish this requires an appropriate interlocking between budgeting and planning at each step. This begins in the departments—and I call your attention to the fact that Assistant Secretary of Defense Hitch, testifying here last week, constantly referred to the "planning-programming-budgeting process" in the Department of Defense. In Secretary McNamara's mind, budgeting and planning are regarded, as they should be, as two aspects of the same process.

A similar objective guides the work of the Bureau of the Budget and the other units of the Executive Office of the President and the White House Office. All of us are endeavoring to tie budgeting and planning tightly together in the work that precedes Presidential decisions. We in the Bureau have established close working relationships with the Special Counsel to the President, the Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs, the Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, and others who advise the President in reaching decisions on national security policy. We have also strengthened our working relationships with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Council of Economic Advisers, in an attempt to make sure that our economic and budget policies are fully consistent, and that our budget and fiscal policies will contribute to the strength and vitality of our economy, both in the long and in the short run.

A second avenue of improvement in the process of budgeting for national security is to extend our time horizon further into the future. I need say little about this objective so far as the Department of Defense is concerned, as Assistant Secretary Hitch discussed it thoroughly last week. You will recall that it is Secretary McNamara's intention to prepare and keep up to date at all times a fully worked out plan and budget for defense programs extending 5 years into the future.

I am not sure we can reach very soon the same goal with respect to other aspects of national security activities aside from the military programs, but this is clearly the correct direction to move. In national security budgeting, and indeed in budgeting for all purposes, we must work with longer range periods than the single year which used to be our standard. I am pleased here to acknowledge the very useful groundwork laid by my predecessor, Mr. Stans, in the closing period of the Eisenhower administration. Among other steps in the direction of longer range budgeting, Mr. Stans last fall directed the Bureau staff in preparing a 10-year projection of the Federal budget for the period 1960 to 1970, which was most informative.

The fact that we want to move toward longer range budgeting, however, does not mean that we can do so easily. While some Federal agencies—such as the Federal Aviation Agency—are accustomed to thinking several years ahead, others are not, and it will take some time before we can obtain fully useful long-range projections from all agencies. However, even our initial steps in recent months to extend the budgetary time horizon have, in my opinion, paid dividends in permitting us to understand better the issues that will determine the size and nature of the budget in future years.

Our purpose here is to improve our lead-time for recognizing important developments in our public policies and for organizing ourselves to find solutions. Whether these issues relate to outer space, housing, education, transportation, urban affairs, science, defense, or whatever, we hope to be able through this approach to detect them sooner and meet them more adequately and with a better sense of priorities.

I should like in closing to point to a third avenue of improvement in budgeting for national security—an avenue on which we have, I think, still far to go. Our budget

for national security must reflect—and can only be as good as our strategy for national security; and I think everyone would agree that the United States has much to do to develop a fully satisfactory strategy for our security. What is the proper mix of military and nonmilitary measures? How can we guide the inevitable processes of change in Asia, Africa, and Latin America to produce free institutions and not communism? How can we step up the rate of economic growth? On these and many other issues affecting our national security, our budgeting can only be as good as our underlying strategy. Much of what is needed is quite beyond budgetary consideration, and improvement must come from analysis of our situation in the world, and imaginative thinking about the courses of action that are open to us.

In at least two respects, however, we can, I think, point to progress through the budget planning route. One of these is the development, described by Assistant Secretary Hitch, of the so-called program packages in Defense Department budgeting. This process of functional budgeting, under which the expenditures for strategic warfare are grouped together, as are those for conventional war, and so forth, permits more accurate comparative analysis of alternative possibilities, and a more realistic understanding of what is proposed to be done. So far as military planning and budgeting are concerned, we believe that this will represent a considerable step forward over the older method of grouping expenditures by service (Army, Navy, Air Force), or expenditure category (personnel, procurement, research and development, etc.).

A second step forward is the decision which underlies the administration's approach to the foreign aid program; namely, to build our economic and military aid efforts around "country programs." This permits us to consider in proper relation to each other, the various alternative military and economic measures we can take to assist a given country—and moreover to relate our aid appropriately to the country's own efforts, to our political objectives in the country, to our diplomatic and information efforts, and so on.

Thus, I believe the use of "program packages" in defense budgeting, and "country programs" in foreign aid budgeting, represent major advances toward sensible planning and budgeting for national security.

I do not wish, however, to minimize the basic difficulty of the problem. When we face the hard questions of how much of the Nation's resources we should devote to national security, and what is the optimum combination of activities to which to devote them, we cannot avoid a considerable degree of uncertainty and considerable room for difference of judgment. We have much to do to improve our understanding of these matters and the analytical framework of ideas which assists us in dealing with them. Any light your Subcommittee can shed on these complex and difficult problems will be most helpful.

I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Fallout Protection and Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 27, 1961

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a selection of resolu-

tions adopted at the 53d annual meeting of the Governor's conference on July 28, 1961:

RESOLUTION ON FALLOUT PROTECTION AND CIVIL DEFENSE

Whereas it is abundantly clear that our Nation and all free peoples are desperately challenged by a hostile system which is explicitly and vigorously committed to the elimination of both freedom and human dignity; and

Whereas the American Nation and its people must stand firmly and purposefully in support of their fundamental beliefs or see those beliefs eroded throughout the world, nation by nation, through subversion and nuclear blackmail; and

Whereas, in order for the American people to have the will to defend their beliefs, they must have the capacity to survive a nuclear attack; and

Whereas the American people today do not have the facilities to protect themselves and their families from fallout, the most dangerous aspect of nuclear war, and their vulnerability constitutes a serious national weakness in the event of a crisis; and

Whereas fallout shelters could save many tens of millions of American lives in the event of nuclear war; and

Whereas fallout protection for our civilian population is possible and is feasible; and

Whereas it is a matter of utmost gravity to the strength and survival of the Nation and the preservation of peace that immediate steps be taken to obtain fallout protection for all our people and otherwise to reinforce our civil defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this conference hereby declares its support for and agreement with the judgment expressed by the President of the United States on May 25, 1961, that " * * * there is no point in delaying the initiation of a nationwide long-range program of identifying present fallout shelter capacity and providing shelter in new and existing structures"; and, further, that this form of survival insurance fully justifies the necessary expenditure of our effort, time and money; and be it further

Resolved, That since the best way to begin to meet the urgent civil defense requirements of our people is to initiate promptly a positive nationwide program for fallout protection, the Governors of our 50 States, for the safety of our people, the defense of our Nation, and the preservation of freedom, take executive action and request local legislation in line with national policy to:

1. Provide fallout shelters to the extent feasible in all State buildings as well as in other public facilities;

2. Provide income tax deductions (in those States having a State income tax), and exempt the cost of fallout shelters from local real estate taxes, up to a maximum of \$100 per planned shelter occupant;

3. Stock foods, medicines, and supplies in strategic locations throughout each State;

4. Construct an alternate protected seat of State government and assist local governments in acquiring similar protected seats of authority so as to assure the continuity of government functioning in times of emergency; and

5. Revise, in cooperation with local governments, all building codes and specifications, where necessary, to permit fallout shelter construction; and be it further

Resolved, That we do hereby reaffirm the recommendations and resolutions adopted by the 1960 Governors' Conference on Fallout Protection and Civil Defense; and be it further

Resolved, That the Governors' Conference Standing Committee on Civil Defense meet with the President of the United States and cooperate with the responsible Federal officials in developing the necessary procedures and policies for the Federal Government's

new and affirmative program for civil defense and in allocating among the Federal, State, and local governments the responsibility for such a program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chairman of the conference to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of Congress; and that the leadership of the Federal Government in cooperation with the States is hereby solicited in this crucial undertaking to insure the strength and the survival of the American Nation and its people.

Greater Regulation of the Drug Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, recently a number of editorials supporting many of the major features of S. 1552, have been published in leading newspapers. The Baltimore Sun of July 18, the Evening Star of July 28, and the Washington Post of July 31 contained such editorials. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, July 18, 1961]

KEFAUVER ON DRUGS

Senator KEFAUVER has a fair general case to back up his bill providing for greater regulation of the drug industry. Profits in some—not all—sectors of the industry have been huge in the wake of various breakthroughs in new medicines. The competition among the companies has become intense and vast sums of money have been put into research and development on the one hand and distribution on the other. This in itself is not bad. Millions of people today owe their health and sometimes their lives to this competitive effort. But Senator KEFAUVER is probably right in insisting that frequently the process has got out of hand.

As for his remedies, a certain selectivity is required. The bill is probably sound in providing for a greater degree of control by the Food and Drug Administration. After all, why shouldn't the FDA, which already has the power to disapprove distribution of a dangerous drug, be able to withhold approval of one which is useless? The American Medical Association wants the determination of the efficacy of drugs left to the discretion of individual doctors—on the ground that this is the best professional opinion. But why shouldn't the FDA get the services of the best in the medical profession?

Some crackdown on fraudulent or unjustified advertising claims may also be advisable, though careful consideration would be required here. In the case of the so-called ethical drugs, which are advertised only in professional journals, a good deal of bureaucratic red tape might be avoided if the FDA restricted itself to riding herd on the periodicals' own fairly careful self-policing procedures.

One of the key provisions of the proposed bill would aim at simplifying the official names of the drugs, which now sometimes become so complex that the doctor simply falls back on a simple and easily remembered

brand name. The hope, and it is a reasonable one, is that doctors would then find it easier to prescribe the drug under its official name and thus permit the patient to do some price comparisons at a reputable druggist.

The drug companies themselves, as well as the public, should welcome a reasonable tightening up on the less responsible members of the industry. But Senator KEFAUVER is likely to get the effective cooperation he needs to pass a bill only if he curbs some of the more flamboyant and all-embracing charges to give voice to during the hearings.

[From the Washington Star, July 28, 1961]

HIGH COST OF DRUGS

While much evidence is yet to be heard on its remedial proposals, the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee is making an increasingly persuasive case for the need of legislation which will reduce the unconscionably high prices of prescription drugs, while at the same time assuring their safety and usefulness. In general, we think the key provisions of the Kefauver bill designed to accomplish these results are on the right track.

As might be expected in a probe of an industry so vast and so complex, the Kefauver bill is full of controversial ramifications. Its main thrust, however, through a variety of means, is to induce more competition in the production and the sale of drugs, and thereby reduce their costs. The subcommittee record is replete with examples of drug costs (and of drug-company profits, as well), which are shockingly excessive by any standard of evaluation.

Among the intriguing goals of the bill is an effort to persuade doctors, in prescribing drugs, to a greater use of the generic (or official) names of drugs, rather than trade names which frequently command far higher prices for precisely the same product. Many doctors, according to the subcommittee, have refrained from this practice in the understandable fear that they might run the risk of placing an inferior drug in the hands of their patients. Other provisions of the Kefauver bill, however, are aimed specifically at assuring that such drugs in fact are not inferior, but that all drugs marketed are both safe and efficacious. This would be accomplished in part by authorizing the Food and Drug Administration (which now has the legal authority only to rule on the safety of drugs) to determine as well that they live up to the claims made for them as to usefulness.

A few weeks ago, at the start of the current round of hearings, we were impressed by the American Medical Association argument that every private physician must determine in the final analysis what drugs are useful for each patient, and that the new control proposed for the FDA might deny doctors access to drugs of possible value to one or another of their patients. In view of the testimony from individual doctors since that time, however, and in view of the explanations offered by Senator KEFAUVER, it is difficult to believe that useful drugs actually would be kept out of doctors' hands. In a very real sense, the FDA already is forced to consider the efficacy of drugs in certifying their safety, for there are few drugs in the entire armamentarium of medicine which do not have the potential for ill effects on someone. In practice, of course, the FDA must weigh these potentials for harm against the degree of curative benefit which each new drug possesses. We see no inconsistency, therefore, in broadening this evaluation of efficacy, or in the separate provisions of the bill which would impose tighter controls on misleading or false information which might be disseminated by drug companies to doctors in their extensive promotional campaigns.

There are other provisions—most particularly one which would modify product-

patent rights on drugs—which require more testimony, especially that of patent experts. Indeed, the drug industry itself has not yet had an opportunity to present its side of the story. The subcommittee nevertheless has amassed a truly overwhelming amount of evidence in support of its charges.

[From the Washington Post, July 31, 1961]

POTENT PRESCRIPTION

Despite the efforts of drug-industry defenders to spread tranquilizing ointment on the controversy, there is considerable public concern over the cost and quality of our drugs. The hearings of Senator KEFAUVER's Antitrust Subcommittee have clearly indicated that the old Pure Food and Drug Act is in need of stronger supplementary medicine. The reform bill offered by Mr. KEFAUVER and Representative EMANUEL CELLER cannot simply be dismissed by indignant talk about statism.

In opposing the bill, the American Medical Association asserts that the profession itself is capable of being the sole watchdog over the efficacy of new drugs. But the AMA's own record hardly inspires confidence. Until 1955, the AMA Journal would accept only advertising that had received the seal of acceptance of the organization's council on drugs. That year, the program was dropped—after a Chicago public relations firm submitted a report suggesting ways in which the Journal's advertising lineage could be increased.

The prescription was effective. Advertising revenues rose from \$4,184,000 in 1955 to \$7,997,000 in 1960. In dropping the seal of acceptance program, the AMA inevitably created the impression that it was less interested in policing misleading claims than in fattening its advertising lineage.

At present, the Government can only determine whether a new drug is safe. The Kefauver-Celler bill would extend this power and enable a finding on the efficacy of a drug. In view of the hundreds of new wonder drugs which are flooding the market—not all of them adequately tested—it is difficult to see how the industry can object to an impartial finding by a public body. The reform has wide support from leading medical experts—including two members of the AMA's own Council on Drugs.

Concerning the high cost of medicine, the Kefauver-Celler bill would empower the Government to establish generic names for drugs. This would enable a doctor to prescribe the less-costly generic name rather than the frequently more expensive brand name—extending to patients a saving already available to institutions. Since the Kefauver hearings produced evidence that the profits of larger drug firms are twice the average for all industry, this seems a reasonable way to help restore some balance.

This newspaper is not convinced that licensing of drug firms, as proposed by the reform bill, is as yet imperative. But improved testing procedures and the establishing of generic names seem a minimal prescription. The principle of public regulation was established a half-century ago in the Pure Food and Drug Act. The users of prescription drugs are often the aged and disadvantaged. They are entitled to every reasonable protection that Government can offer.

POLLUTION OF MERRIMACK RIVER

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the serious problem of the pollution of the Merri-

mack River is more graphically pointed out with each passing day. The rapid growth of the cities and communities in the Merrimack Valley make this situation more acute with the passing of time. In the interests of the general health and welfare of the people of the valley action must soon be forthcoming in the eliminating this serious pollution problem and blight on one of the areas important natural resources.

Senator SALTONSTALL and I have called upon Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Abraham Ribicoff, to establish in Lowell, Mass., the Northeast Water Pollution Research Laboratory. This would be an important step toward the purification of the waters of the Merrimack and the cleaning up of what has been referred to as one of the biggest open sewers in the country. I call to the attention of the House the following letter from Lowell City Manager Frank E. Barrett to Secretary Ribicoff and a recent editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun:

THE CITY OF LOWELL, MASS.
August 1, 1961.

The Honorable ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: We, in Lowell, are tremendously interested in the proposed legislation dealing with the Federal water pollution controls for the current year.

Specifically, we are primarily interested in the proposal that at least one water pollution demonstration and research facility be established in the northeast area of the country.

We feel that a study will show that Lowell is ideally situated for the location of the northeast area facility. As you know, the Merrimack River is one of the most important of the northeast rivers, extending as it does from the uppermost regions of New Hampshire to the sea, flowing through a large number of industrial communities.

Equally important is the fact that after 30 years of consideration the city of Lowell, this year, is establishing a \$2½ million water treatment plant on the Merrimack River in Lowell in order to obtain an adequate water supply for the area, and to eliminate a water supply problem that has existed since the early 1920's.

The Merrimack River is fed, in part, by the Nashua River, and in Lowell the famed Concord River joins up with the Merrimack.

Lowell is classified as a distress area. The city has, however, made tremendous strides in changing its complex from that of a leading cotton textile center to one of great diversification.

We need, however, every bit of assistance the Federal Government can render, in order for us to obtain our goal of economic sufficiency. The location of the planned northeast water pollution facility in Lowell would contribute greatly to this end. We feel that we have a lot to offer in the attainment of this objective.

I, and other representatives of the city, would be happy to meet with you or your representatives, either here or in Washington, for a detailed discussion of the matter.

Respectfully yours,

FRANK E. BARRETT,
City Manager.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, July 29, 1961]

POLLUTION PROGRESS

Pollution of the Merrimack River has long been a problem of the valley in Massachusetts and New Hampshire. We recall that many years ago a public official referred to the river as one of the biggest open sewers in the country, as he urged correction.

Although several communities in New Hampshire have been making progress in cleaning up their local conditions through sewage disposal plants, the main project, from the mountain lakes to the mouth of the river at Newburyport is a huge proposition.

The mayor of Newburyport heads up a committee that is dedicated to the task of forcing cities and towns in the valley to do something about sewage right away. He claims that the clam beds have been contaminated and made useless for years because of pollution and foul waters that flow down the Merrimack, and he also pointed to several beaches in his area that have been closed because of health hazards.

We all agree, no doubt, with the mayor and look for the day when the waters of the Merrimack will be fresh and clear at all points. But time is still a major factor, and we cannot expect miracles in a brief space of weeks or months.

One of the most progressive steps toward improving conditions in the Merrimack comes with the announcement that both Congressman Morse and Senator Saltonstall have recommended Lowell as the site for the northeast water pollution research laboratory. This would provide scientific studies that will eventually lead to purification of the waters of the Merrimack and other New England rivers.

We hope the laboratory will be established here at the central point of the Merrimack, and, like the mayor of Newburyport, we look forward to the time when the river water will be as clean as the proverbial whistle.

Fishery Research, Rehabilitation, and Development Projects—Recommendation by Wisconsin Fish Dealers' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on June 15, the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee held hearings on S. 1230—a measure proposed to increase funds for fishery research, rehabilitation, and development projects.

As yet, however, no further action has been scheduled.

Today, I was privileged to receive from Mr. Alan Smith, chairman of the Wisconsin Fish Dealers' Association, a letter urging first, support of the bill; and, second, adoption of a number of amendments, as recommended by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

Because of the significance to the fish industry, I respectfully urge that the committee give further consideration to this measure, as early as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have these proposals printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN FISH DEALERS ASSOCIATION,

August 2, 1961.

DEAR SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY: We urge your support of Senate bill 1230 with the

following amendments as recommended by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries:

1. The bureau suggests that of the funds that would be distributed under the terms of this proposed legislation, two-thirds should be apportioned among the States for the purposes set forth in this bill, i.e., for research, fisheries rehabilitation, and development projects. We believe that one-third of such moneys should be distributed as grants to educational and research institutions for fishery studies and for the training of scientific personnel.

The conduct of basic research and other fisheries studies in educational and research institutions is of the greatest importance to the advancement of fishery management and conservation. Training of scientific personnel for staffing State and Federal fishery agencies is lagging. In both cases much too little is being done to meet future needs.

2. The bureau believes that there should be a minimum and a maximum apportionment to the States, such as in the Dingell-Johnson Act (16 U.S.C. 777). Under the formula set forth in this bill, approximately one-fifth of the funds would go to a single State. We believe it is obvious that important fishery problems are not concentrated to that extent in one State. For this reason, the bureau would suggest that no State should receive more than 5 percent of the funds. Also, the bureau believes that no State involved in commercial fishery problems should receive less than one-half of 1 percent. Such minimum should be adequate for a single project.

3. The bureau suggests that this proposed legislation should require the matching by the States of Federal apportionments as in the Dingell-Johnson Act. This procedure is a well-accepted principle that insures greater interest on the part of the recipient and consequently better chances of accomplishing the purposes in question. Matching of funds on an equal basis should not be unduly burdensome to the individual States and will provide for adequate funds for long-delayed State fishery programs.

4. The Bureau suggests that Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands should be included along with the States as they have commercial fisheries also.

5. Funds apportioned to the States should remain available for a prescribed period, in the Bureau's opinion. The Bureau suggests this might be for a period of 2 years after the funds first become available, as in the Dingell-Johnson Act.

6. Provision should be made for the disposition of unused funds. If a State does not avail itself of funds apportioned to it, the unused balance of the funds might be made available for other use, such as for the commercial fisheries research and other programs of this department. A comparable provision is included in the Dingell-Johnson Act. Not more than 8 percent of funds available for distribution should be subject to use by the Secretary for his expenses in administration, investigation, and execution of the proposed legislation. Such a provision is contained in the Dingell-Johnson Act. If an allowance for expenses of this kind is not made, administration of the proposed legislation will require substantial curtailment of the current fisheries program financed by our regular appropriations.

7. Any legislation on this subject should, of course, set forth clearly the terms and method of payment of apportioned funds to the States and other essential details.

Enactment of this proposed legislation would result in the transfer to the Bureau of approximately \$5 million annually for the purposes in question. The Bureau has proposed that, with the exception of approximately 8 percent, which will be needed for administrative purposes, the remaining 92

percent would be apportioned on the basis of two-thirds to the States for research and other purposes and one-third as grants to educational and research institutions.

WISCONSIN FISH DEALERS'
ASSOCIATION,
ALAN SMITH,
Chairman, Legislative Committee.

What Is President Kennedy Prepared To Sacrifice?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials from the Chicago Daily Tribune and the Wall Street Journal raise a pertinent question in answer to the President's call upon the American people for sacrifices: What is the President prepared to sacrifice? Will he sacrifice politics as usual with the public purse? Is he prepared to halt the appeal for votes by the use of Federal funds for bigger and wilder Federal handout programs? The American people are willing to make any sacrifice, as they always have, to protect the Nation, but the least they expect is that the man they look to for leadership is willing to do the same.

The editors follow:

[From the Chicago Tribune]

Mr. KENNEDY ASKS FOR SACRIFICES

President Kennedy is going to get almost everything he asked for in his broadcast on Tuesday evening. The interviews with leading Members of the House and Senate of both parties leave no doubt on that score.

The only thing that could keep Congress from voting the addition manpower and the additional billions for arms would be a great clamor from the American people themselves against the program, and that is not going to be forthcoming. It will not be forthcoming for two reasons.

One is that almost all the people agree with the President on the importance of Berlin as a symbol and as an outpost. They are in accord with him, too, when he says a retreat from Berlin in response to Russian threats would prove devastating to our own future, to our alliances, and to the cause of freedom in the satellite countries.

The other reason is that the people have faith in the military judgment of their military leaders and even if they lacked this faith would have to admit that the ordinary citizen is in no position to measure military requirements. This is so because much of the information on which a judgment must be based is technical and much more of it is secret.

So Mr. Kennedy is going to have little trouble imposing new sacrifices on the American people. What was notably lacking from his speech was any suggestion that he was willing to sacrifice any slightest element of his New Frontier program for the sake of national solvency and the common good.

He called for a sharp revision upward of a military program he had recommended to the Congress as adequate just a few months ago, when the conflicts over Berlin, Laos, the

Congo, Cuba, and the rest were almost as clearly defined as they are today. But he did not call for a deficit-reducing downward revision of his estimates for the foreign aid that wins us no fast friends. In striking contrast, the British Government threatens to withdraw troops from Germany in order to save expense, and plans to restrict foreign aid and investment programs.

He likewise retains the voter-bribing subsidies that are the political essence of the New Frontier. Did Mr. Kennedy volunteer to cut down his raids on the Federal Treasury for housing, roadbuilding, farm payments, school support, and other luxuries that could surely be dispensed with, at least in part, until the financial and military emergency is overcome?

No, indeed. Mr. Kennedy will not sacrifice a single purchased vote, a single pet scheme to advance his political fortunes. He pretended to speak with authority in saying that the growing prosperity of the Nation would so greatly increase tax revenues that no harm would result from adding \$3½ billion to the appropriations. Nobody can be sure of that; but everyone can be certain that a busted treasury and a resultant inflation will gravely hamper any nation's military efforts.

The President says there is no need now to raise taxes. Wait until next year, he argues, again disclosing his unwillingness to sacrifice any of his own popularity for the sake of the national welfare. Nobody wants to pay more taxes but if Mr. Kennedy will not economize on nonmilitary items and is determined to spend a lot more money, common prudence requires him to recommend new taxes now and to press for them with all the influence he can command.

In spite of the one-sided sacrifices he has called for, Mr. Kennedy can count upon the support of the American people. He has failed them but they will not allow that to alter their devotion to their country.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S TASKS

When President Kennedy spoke to the Nation the other evening, the task before him was not that of convincing the American people of the reality of the Soviet menace or of the need for this country to face resolutely the crisis that menace directly poses at Berlin.

If anything, the country has been in advance of the President on these matters. Every measure of public opinion, before Vienna as well as since, suggests a people far more fearful that their leaders might accept humiliation in the name of peace than a people panicked by the prospects of a clash at Berlin.

So we think we can take it as settled that the American people—however others may feel—are prepared to make those sacrifices President Kennedy asked of them to meet this crisis. The Congress will vote the new arms, and those who are called upon to bear them will do so, as they have always done before.

Mr. Kennedy's true tasks, the other evening, lay elsewhere. The first, of course, was to convince Mr. Khrushchev of what he did not convince him at Vienna; that is, that our talk of firmness is not empty words. But beyond that, to give the American people the feeling that their leadership is not merely strong in intent but capable in action and wise in measures—or, put bluntly, to restore the confidence so badly shaken in the President's first 6 months in office.

As best we can judge, Mr. Kennedy performed the first task superbly. At least it is extremely difficult for us to imagine that Premier Khrushchev could have heard the President's words and regarded the specific measures he proposed without saying to himself, this is a man and a nation that means business.

There was no bombast in the President's tone or words. But he is adding, altogether, some \$6 billion to the defense budget of last January; he is increasing the manpower of each of our armed services, stepping up their state of readiness and redeploying them into a more determined posture. Moreover, he should have made it clear even to Mr. Khrushchev that this is just a beginning, if more is needed. "We are clear about what must be done—and we intend to do it . . . Everything essential to the security of freedom will be done."

Now we are not so foolish as to assume that the men in the Kremlin will necessarily reason like other men; other would-be conquerors before them have simply closed their minds in order to believe what they wanted to believe. So there is in the President's speech no guarantee whatever that the peace will be preserved.

But if it be not, the fault will not be any failure of Mr. Kennedy's to speak warning, or to give those warnings substance. We hardly see what more he could have done on that score.

And that in itself, we think, should help Mr. Kennedy on his second task. At least he has put aside the fears haunting a good many people before Vienna that he was not sufficiently aware of the nature of the Soviet menace—and that he might be tempted either to succumb to the wiles of the Soviet leader or to put so high a price upon peace that he would yield to threats.

The President also, we think, must have impressed his countrymen in another way. In showing firmness he did not rush to belligerence. There is not a single line in his speech that rattles the atom bomb or makes any threat to the Soviet Union; there was no indication that the President had his hand upon the panic button. Moreover, he showed plainly that while he was serious about the military responses, he was not foreclosing other responses to the Soviet challenge.

All this makes a good beginning on what remains the President's most crucial task, the restoration of confidence in the leadership of his administration. And it is now up to the President to complete it.

It is never enough that a President of the United States show his intent and will. He must also convince the country—and today, even the world—that he and those about him bring wisdom to the task of carrying out that intent. In short, that they have thought intelligently and truly know what they are doing.

If Mr. Kennedy has thus far fallen short in this task, for his political friends as well as for his opponents, it is largely because he has had the air of a general scattering his troops in all directions. In his first 6 months he has sent half-a-hundred messages to Congress on almost every conceivable subject, and he has called for more spending on almost every conceivable human activity.

Quite apart from political philosophy, none of this has suggested disciplined thinking or any awareness that the Nation's resources of money or energy needed to be husbanded for crucial tasks clearly seen. What has made the memory of the Cuban fiasco linger so long was not its immediate effects on Cuba but the whole air of improvisation that lay over it.

All this cannot be blown away in a single speech. Some uneasiness lingers over the President's plans for military spending, because only 2 months ago he was asking new billions of Congress, explaining that they would put us in a posture to meet the threats around the world. Now it is more billions still; and if the plans of July be necessary, it must mark as improvisation the plans of May.

Nor has the President yet banished all uneasiness about the scattering of our re-

sources. The Government will spend \$6 billion more on arms, but apparently not one penny less on anything else. That does not suggest the President himself has yet thought out clearly an order of national priorities.

For our part, we have no doubt that President Kennedy will get the support of the country for what he specifically proposes to do now about Berlin. But if that support is to include full confidence in the President's whole conduct of office, it must also be earned by something more than a mere calling up of arms.

Pope John XXIII's New Encyclical "Mater et Magistra"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Pope John XXIII's new encyclical "Mater et Magistra" is now receiving the close study and attention of scholars, clergymen, social scientists, legislators, and others throughout the free world and, I would imagine, in some quarters behind the Iron Curtain.

It is clear that Pope John has given us a statement of historic significance. It is also a statement which should give great personal comfort to all those who have worked for so many years to put democratic government in the service of man without impairing the freedom of man.

Much more study will be given to the encyclical in the years to come, but initial reaction has already been recorded. One of the most pertinent statements was made by George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO in the July 29 issue of the AFL-CIO News.

Another analysis was given in my home State by the Advocate, official newspaper for the diocese of Newark, in an editorial of July 27. In the same issue, the newspaper carried a roundup of opinion from throughout the State. The variety of comment is another indication of the significance of the encyclical. I was particularly interested in the reaction given to Pope John's comments on international relations and the plight of farm-workers in the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUIDE FOR A WORLD IN TORMENT

(By George Meany)

The social encyclical issued by Pope John XXIII provides highly significant signposts for human advancement at this most critical turn in the history of mankind.

Humanity now possesses the scientific knowledge and technical know-how for eliminating poverty, ignorance and illness. But in the hands of Communist dictators, bent on world conquest, this very knowledge and remarkable industrial progress have tended to menace mankind with the limitless horrors and destruction of nuclear warfare.

Whole peoples who once meekly submitted to a foreign yoke and degrading poverty no

longer accept their plight as a matter of fate. They are determined to win freedom from oppression and hunger, eager to build modern economies and improve their conditions. But this very laudable struggle for national freedom and economic progress is endangered by hypocritical forces seeking to exploit its efforts and sacrifices in the interest of the new Soviet colonialism.

These are the great opportunities and the grave dangers so characteristic of our times. It is against this background of developments that the social encyclical must be viewed.

Its calm analysis and constructive proposals for meeting such complex problems of our times as socialization, the elimination or reduction of economic imbalance within countries and the urgency of just relations between nations in different stages of economic development will attract much support among peoples of all faiths.

Labor everywhere will be deeply impressed by the encyclical's rejection of the belief held in certain quarters that socialization, growing in extent and depth, necessarily reduces men to automatons.

In view of what has been happening behind the Iron Curtain, free labor throughout the world will welcome the conclusion of Pope John XXIII that socialization can and ought to be realized in such a way as to draw from it the advantages contained therein and to remove or restrain the negative aspects.

Even the most rugged individualists will have to see the soundness and justice of the encyclical in stressing that "private enterprise must contribute to effect economic and social balance among the different zones of the same country" and that "public authorities . . . must encourage and help private enterprise, entrusting to it, as far as efficiently possible, the continuation of the economic development."

The social encyclical will arouse fervent approval, especially in the developing countries, for its forthright and sound consideration of "probably the most difficult problem of the modern world—the relationship between the political communities that are economically advanced and those in the process of development." We are confident that the peoples of the free world will view with full favor the indisputable conclusion of the encyclical that:

"Given the growing interdependence among the peoples of the earth, it is not possible to preserve lasting peace if glaring economic and social inequality among them persists. We are all equally responsible for the undernourished peoples. Therefore, it is necessary to educate one's conscience to the sense of responsibility which weighs upon each and every one, especially upon those who are more blessed with this world's goods."

Wherever labor is free to express its own opinion, it will hail the encyclical's eloquent plea for social justice and its insistence that the "workers should be paid a wage which allows them to live a truly human life and to face up with dignity to their family responsibilities." The international free trade union movement will certainly not fail to see the significance of the encyclical's forceful support of the worker's right to an effective voice in the running of industry and public economic planning.

The social encyclical should have a most salutary effect on the ranks of free world labor. It should go a long way toward removing the debris of prejudice left over from the lay-clerical struggles of the 19th century.

Once the air is thus cleared, a most serious obstacle to the greater unification of free labor, especially in Europe and Africa, shall have been removed. Such higher free world labor unity was never more urgent

than it is today when the Soviet imperialist threat to human freedom, national independence and world peace is so grave.

MOTHER AND TEACHER

By his encyclical "Mater et Magistra" under date of May 15, 1961, Pope John XXIII has again marked his pontificate as one of enduring importance. His commemoration of the 70th anniversary of the monumental encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, "Rerum Novarum," begins with the summary of the major social advances begun by that document, but it adds a treatment, in some cases only in summary, of many pressing current affairs in our social order.

Writers have already noted the approval, subject to restrictions, which the Holy Father gives to our age's use of such social institutions as social security and insurance programs, as well as to such collective actions as unions and cooperatives.

This careful approval of the socializing movements of current decades may put to rest the fears of those Catholics who hesitated to support these institutions lest they lead to socialism. Pope John makes a pointed condemnation of socialism; but socialization is approved so long as the rights and dignity of individuals and the important principle of subsidiarity are safeguarded.

Throughout the entire teaching of this encyclical runs the theme of the common good of the world. The common or general good has always been stressed in Catholic social teachings; but Pope John makes it clear that in an age when communication and commerce have tied the world's nations closely together, the common good must be that of all the world and not just of one's own nation. Thus in the United States our management of food surplus must take into account the needs of underfed and emerging nations and not just that of America.

Pope Leo had brought to the world's attention the social aspect of private property.

Pope John stresses this with the reminder that the world's wealth and resources belong to the entire world and not just favored nations. Failure to use the world's land and possessions in a spirit of universal justice and charity lies at the root of so many current disorders. Overpopulation, for example, will not be solved until this principle is acknowledged and made effective.

Catholic social teachers and scholars will do us a great service if they will unfold with diligence the full riches of this crowded encyclical. So many issues of wages and employment, agriculture and industry are here compacted that only the expert will fully appreciate the new advances and any new emphasis.

All of us, though, should read this encyclical in meditation and prayer. For us there is instruction and inspiration. For the world, there is hope and light to find a Christian way through the intricate relations, involvements of what has been until today a crazy mixed-up century.

JERSEY ROUNDUP ON ENCYCICAL

(By Ed Grant)

NEWARK.—"Amazing," "masterly," "superb" and "progressive" are some of the adjectives applied to Pope John XXIII's new encyclical "Mater et Magistra" by North Jersey experts in the social, international and lay apostolate field, whose opinions were solicited this week by the Advocate. At the same time, they stressed the need for a strong "followup" of its teachings.

Members of this panel, each of whom made an independent contribution, were Rev. Gerard Rooney, C.P., of Sign magazine, president of the National Catholic Social Action Conference; Rev. William J. Smith, S.J., director of the St. Peter's Institute of Indus-

trial Relations, Jersey City; Rev. Aloysius J. Welsh, S.T.D., director of the Pope Pius XII Institute of Social Education; James Lamb, director of the Association for International Development, Paterson; Joseph Lets of the Young Christian Workers of St. Paul's, Ramsey; Dr. Howard T. Ludlow, professor of management, Seton Hall University; and Dr. John C. H. Wu, professor of Asian Studies at Seton Hall University and member of the International Court of Arbitration at The Hague.

In hailing the encyclical as progressive, Dr. Wu said, "In our church, it is the leaders who are in the vanguard, the faithful who lag behind. The whole body of the church should have followed the lead of Leo XIII in 'Rerum Novarum.' If this encyclical, published 70 years ago, had been followed with all of our strength, there would have been no room for communism.

"But we do not have to cry over split milk. We can hope that this time the process of carrying out the words of Pope John XXIII will be more effective and systematic. There is a difference between 1891 and 1961; there is now a remarkable awareness on the part of many members of the church of the necessity to respond to the leadership of our Holy Father."

Of the encyclical itself, Dr. Wu said, "It is most opportune; it not only restates but also develops the principles of 'Rerum Novarum' and brings them up to date, particularly with regard to the new world economic situation. It strikes at the roots of the problems between the Communist and non-Communist world.

"The encyclical restates in the clearest words the position of our church in social philosophy, as neither individualistic nor socialistic, but as having its center in man. It follows the words of Pius XII's Christmas message of 1942: 'The purpose of all social life remains the same, ever sacred, ever obligatory, the development of the personal values of man who is made in the image of God.'

"Even when the encyclical speaks of socialization, the central purpose is never lost sight of and the process of socialization, envisaged by Pope John XXIII, serves to expand and perfect, rather than frustrate the human personality. This process must not be primarily a governmental process, but rather a free and spontaneous development of nonpolitical professional and social groups conscious of the need for enlarged social organizations to take care of the common good of mankind. We can no longer talk on a national level; our plan must have the background of the whole world.

"On our age, national economics are no longer viable, except in an international context, and it is imperative that more advanced nations take the lead in establishing a world economy which will benefit all, especially those newly developing nations who are so much in need.

"Particularly noteworthy is an explicit recognition of an increased need for free passage of people across national boundaries. This should include an opportunity for exiles to settle permanently in the countries of their choice."

Father Smith calls the encyclical an "amazing document" which will "enlighten minds and warm hearts for many years, perhaps centuries, to come. The message is global in outlook. And yet, the remarkable personality of Christ's vicar seems to enliven every page so that the reader almost feels it could have been addressed to him personally.

"Without doubt, 'Mater et Magistra' is unique, distinctive, and wholly characteristic of our reigning sovereign pontiff. The original message of Leo XIII was that of the pioneer. It was philosophic, basic, and

profound. The words of Pius XI were those of the modernizer. He builds the ideal of social order upon the foundation which Leo XIII had laid. Pius XII opened new doors and windows of his predecessor's edifice to let in rays of light and give greater illumination to the interior. But it was left to John XXIII to reveal how truly worldwide is the structure of the social order as envisioned by the church. Without apology, but in a spirit of profound faith and reverence, he assumes the role of champion of God.

"The working people, particularly trade unionists who have not lost the spark of idealism, will find solace and encouragement and strength in the Pope's evaluation of their role in society. They will be comforted to know how closely he identifies himself with their thoughts and hopes and aspirations.

"The ultraconservative, the idle rich, the materialistic minded 'let's keep up with the Jones' Catholic, and those who cry 'keep the government out of it' will find little comfort in the solemn pronouncements of the pontiff. The words 'social' and 'socialization' must now be accepted with proper respect by anyone who is seriously intent upon 'thinking with the church.'

While cautioning that some passages must be read and reread for their full understanding, Father Welsh calls the encyclical a "masterly synthesis of Catholic social teaching. There is practically no area of human social activity neglected, yet in the main, the Holy Father's comments are consistently incisive and balanced.

"Readers will best appreciate the finely woven nuances of 'Mater et Magistra' if they have a previous familiarity with the social encyclicals of Leo XIII and Pius XI, but all who approach the study of Pope John's encyclical in good will should be duly enlightened and inspired.

"The archdiocese of Newark has a head start in implementing some of the Pope's directions. His reaffirmation that 'Christian social doctrine is an integral part of the Christian conception of life' and as such should be taught systematically in Catholic schools of every kind, 'especially in seminaries,' will be gratifying to authorities at Immaculate Conception Seminary, at which such courses have been conducted for over 20 years.

"Our own Pius XII Institute, St. Peter's Institute of Industrial Relations and adult education programs being instituted in more and more of our parishes offer excellent channels for reducing the papal social principles and directives to practice by way of the zealous lay apostles formed therein."

Father Rooney said that "The Holy Father has reaffirmed the profound concern of Christ and His church for the earthly needs of all people as well as for their eternal salvation. The Pope sees the solidarity of all mankind under God and outlines the laws of God whereby every man on earth should receive a fair share of the world's goods.

"The Pope applauds the advantages of modern science and technology, blesses the increasing socialization (not socialism) of modern states, encourages the desire of workers to share a greater degree of responsibility in ownership, management and profits and calls for the richer nations to help the poorer.

"In America, we can well be proud that a great deal of our social legislation already expresses the social doctrine of Leo XIII and has anticipated much of the more detailed doctrine of John XXIII.

"Catholic social action groups will surely receive a tremendous stimulus to renewed action from this sublime document. Thus far, the failure of vast numbers of Catholics to understand the church's social doctrine has kept the spiritual influence of the

church from properly fulfilling its mission to civil society. With the way to action so clearly pointed by Pope John, great energies in the church should now be released to enrich community life in America."

Striking parallels between the new encyclical and the language of mediation laws in the United States are pointed up by Dr. Ludlow, a member of the New Jersey Board of Mediation.

"In 1886, New York State established its board to provide 'for the amicable adjustment of grievances and disputes.' Later laws call for the desire to 'promote permanent industrial peace' (New Jersey), the advocacy of 'sound union-employer relationships' (California), the providing of both mediation and factfinding (Michigan), or contain similar phrases in keeping with this section from part II of the new encyclical:

"Modern times have seen a broad development of associations of workers for the specific purposes of cooperation, in particular by means of collective bargaining, and the general recognition of such associations in the juridical codes."

"Of even greater interest is the fact that mediators usually await the call of the conflicting parties before entering a dispute. The Connecticut board in 1960 stated: 'The first responsibility for industrial peace rests upon unions and management.' In 'Mater et Magistra' we find: 'Only in the event that the interested parties do not or cannot fulfill their functions, does it fall back on the state to intervene in the field of labor.'

The Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service often violates the principle of subsidiarity when it intervenes in purely local labor matters, and the new encyclical warns of this form of encroachment in this manner: ' * * * it is an injustice, a grave evil, and a disturbance of right order for a larger and higher organization to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies.'

"Whether on the Federal or State level, however, the mediation agency strives to meet the demands of both justice and the common good, while recognizing in the language of the encyclical, 'that the relations between the employers and directors on the one hand and the employees on the other, be marked by appreciation, understanding, a loyal and active cooperation, and devotion to an undertaking common to both.'

Lamb sees the encyclical as a call to action for the lay apostolate, saying that it "leaves no doubt as to what should be the mind and action of Catholics vis-a-vis the staggering social problems that confront our human family.

"Here in the United States, the church grows in many important dimensions: sanctity, membership, sense of mission. Despite too-large contingents of rugged individualists, anti-intellectuals, isolationists and the like, lacking any real grasp of the implications of the mystical body, a beautiful and positive maturing is slowly (and painfully) taking place. It can be hoped that the new encyclical will accelerate the process.

"That more Catholics will come to see that foreign policy and international organizations must be everyone's vital concern; that high taxes can be a matter of justice; that it is essential for selfless and competent laymen to share themselves with the developing countries; that foreign students and visitors be warmly welcomed and shown what we believe—as Americans and as Catholics.

"Already inspiring efforts by an increasing number of bishops, priests, and laymen prove that we are beginning to understand what the holy father means when he says: 'The solidarity which binds all men and makes them members of the same family imposes upon political communities enjoying abundance of material goods not to remain indifferent to those political communities whose citizens suffer from poverty, misery, and

hunger and who lack even the elemental rights of the human persons.'

"And that since 'the church is confronted with the immense task of giving a human and Christian note to modern civilization,' we cannot flee from the truth that this involves personal knowledge, sacrifice, and commitment."

Speaking on that part of the encyclical which deals with rural life, Leo says, "The problems in agriculture have been given considerable thought by Pope John, in striking similarity to the way in which Leo XIII tackled the problems of the industrial revolution in 1891, stressing that there is a responsibility in solving these problems in justice and equity by Christian men.

"Industrial life should not dominate agricultural life causing misery and poverty of economic conditions substantially lower than other sectors of society. The gap which exists between them should be brought closer together in proper balance. To effect this end, the Pope said, 'the systems of social insurance and social security can contribute efficaciously—for restoring the balance in standards of living in the different categories of people.'

"Thus the Holy Father decries the plight of people such as the United States 2 million farm-wage earners who are deprived of a life proper to human beings because of their low-wage income, where wages and living conditions are caused by ineffective and neglectful governmental systems of regulation, and the indifference of people outside of agriculture.

"The Pope calls for order and a working together of all segments of society. Farmers are urged to pull together and form cooperatives to receive a fairer profit on his products.

"Most American farmers are organized as the Pope suggests, but the 2 million workers have no organizations, do not have the voice which Pope John states is necessary because 'no one hears, much less pays attention to isolated voices.' Attempts to include these workers in social legislation are frustrated by the strong factory-corporation farm lobby in Washington.

"It is significant to note the emergence of the factory-corporation farm and the rapid decline of family farms in America, substantiated by the fact that 5 percent of the farms hire 90 percent of the workers. It is the family size farm with its beautiful life that the Pope desires to save.

"Much of the world is engaged in agricultural production and the Pope's message is worldwide. He has given a clear directive to America and to our responsibility to poorer nations: that we offend against 'justice and humanity' if we 'destroy or squander goods that other people need in order to live.'

Speech by Jesse R. Smith at Pioneer Day Celebration of Utahans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALLACE F. BENNETT

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, last Saturday former residents of Utah now living in the Nation's Capital gathered to celebrate Utah's traditional Pioneer Day. It was only 114 years ago that the pioneers first came into the Salt Lake valley. On that occasion Mr. Jesse R. Smith, formerly a staff member of the

Senate Committee on Finance, delivered an excellent address, recalling to our minds the problems and the hardships of that historic trek which ended in the Salt Lake valley on July 24, 1847.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's address may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PIONEER HERITAGE

(Speech delivered by Jesse R. Smith on July 29 in connection with the Pioneer Day celebration of Utahans in the Nation's Capitol—at Fairfield Farm, Virginia)

It is a moving experience to review the history of the Mormon exodus from Nauvoo, Ill., to the Salt Lake Valley—particularly if one has driven across the country and has some idea of distances. But we are so far removed from those stirring days—our lives have been so transformed by the intervening 114 years—that it is virtually impossible to visualize conditions as they were then, or to comprehend the suffering, the hardships and privations they underwent, or to sense the indomitable courage they manifested when adversity was the darkest.

Twenty miles a day. What does 20 miles mean to you? If you travel by jet it represents 2 minutes. If you travel by car along a superhighway, it means 20 minutes driving time. How many of you have ever walked 20 miles in a day? To those pioneers—men, women, and children alike, generally, 20 miles meant 40,000 or 50,000 weary footsteps, up at 5 and confronted that night with the sure knowledge that many 20 miles lay ahead of them in the days to follow. Nor was it in weather of their choosing or along pleasant byways.

In rereading the story of the great Mormon trek, one thought occurs that had not been so apparent before—it was in the year 1846, not 1847, when the greatest sacrifices and suffering and stark tragedy occurred. It was in 1846 when the great test came—the test of survival, which they magnificently met; the year when hundreds of their numbers were quietly laid away in unmarked graves along the trail.

Let's go back to the summer of 1845. Their prophet, Joseph Smith, had been dead only a year. The Mormons were still numb from his tragic martyrdom. Their enemies, mostly ruffians of that era, had again become emboldened and from the communities around Nauvoo came persecution and oppression. At the Fourth of July celebration in a town 15 miles away, the Independence Day speaker told the assembled crowd that they, the citizens of Carthage, could not consider themselves free Americans so long as the Mormons remained in Illinois. Mobbing, and whippings increased and finally the leaders of the Mormon people and many of the people themselves became reconciled to the idea of abandoning their lovely city, "Nauvoo the beautiful," a community of fine homes, well laid out streets, good farms and an impressive temple which crowned the landscape. They realized that sooner or later they must remove themselves far to the West, to a place "which God for them prepared" where they would be secure from their enemies and build a place of their own and live in peace and happiness.

And so in September 1845, the Mormon leaders reached an agreement—a written agreement—with the leaders of the surrounding communities, that they, the Mormons would leave Illinois in 1846. It was stipulated however, that they should be given time to settle their affairs, sell their homes and farms as advantageously as they could under the circumstances and be unharassed while making preparations for the long journey ahead.

They fell to work with a will. They were organized into companies, each having its own blacksmith shop and other facilities. Iron was brought in, even from distant places. The blacksmith shops sounded with activity early and late. The wheelwrights, the carpenters and cabinetmakers were busily engaged in making wagons and other conveyances. The women worked tirelessly getting provisions together and making clothing. But their enemies would not wait. There were evil men in the area who hated the Mormon religion and coveted their lands.¹ By the new year, 1846, the forces of oppression became so violent that the Mormons were faced with the danger of physical extinction. And so, in the dead of winter, they were expelled from Nauvoo.

The first flatboats started ferrying teams and wagons across the Mississippi in early February—Bancroft records it as February 10. The crossing of the river was stepped up each day. On the 15th, a blizzard struck, followed by intense cold and the river was frozen solidly so that the next day, February 16, the remainder of the emigration crossed over the ice to the Iowa side. This band of exiles made their temporary camp at Sugar Creek, a few miles into Iowa, barely out of sight of Nauvoo. The first night at Sugar Creek, nine babies were born² "in every variety of circumstance except those to which the mothers were accustomed," wrote Eliza R. Snow. On the morning of the 17th, all members of the camp gathered around to receive instruction and encouragement from their leader, Brigham Young. He stood up in a wagon and in a loud voice called, "Attention the whole camp of Israel." He told them that the Lord had been with them in times past and would continue to be with them if they kept his commandments; that His empire "was established and the powers of hell should not prevail against it."³ And then with comparatively light hearts, this homeless band of exiles turned resolutely to the west and started their great trek through the wilderness.

Of this event Bancroft has written, "In the present instance though all were poor and some destitute, and though man and beast were exposed to driving rain and hail, and the chill blasts of a Western winter often sweeping down upon them unchecked from the limitless prairie, they made the best of it, and instead of wasting time in useless repining, set themselves at work to make the most of their joys and the least of their sorrows."⁴

Surely this was their finest hour.

The great migration continued westward, though at times their progress was slow indeed because of impassable mud and other inclement conditions of the winter and spring. But these exiles were not aimless drifters of the wilderness. They were a well organized, well disciplined people, purposeful, and with a destination in mind.

At night or morning all were called to prayers at the sound of a bugle. There were brass or stringed instruments in every company. Camp fires held their charm when the days work was finished. Dancing and singing was an indispensable part of their lives, and helped carry them on. Wise Brigham Young understood the value of wholesome recreation.

By April 24, the advance companies arrived at the east fork of the Grand River, about midway through Iowa—150 miles west of Nauvoo. We read, "Here a temporary settlement was selected which they named Garden Grove. Two days later a council meeting was held and 359 laboring men were selected to cut trees and make rails; 10 to build fences; 48 to build houses; 12 to dig wells and 10 to build bridges. The remainder were employed in clearing land and preparing it for cultivation. Every one

was busy, and in a few days a respectable village, magic like, had risen in the wilderness."⁵

Then on westward they went and at a place they named Mount Pisgah, 30 miles farther, another settlement was founded as if by magic within a few days. Fields were plowed and planted; the succeeding bands of pioneers tended these fields and later companies harvested the crops. It was absolutely necessary that they raise their own food even as they marched. This was to be an important part of their diet that fall, winter, and the next spring.

What a sight this mighty exodus must have presented. We are told that at one time between the Mississippi and the Missouri Rivers no less than 2,000 wagons could be counted wending their way through Iowa. And the "saints" had 30,000 cattle and immense flocks of sheep and other animals. By the end of August 1846, the bulk of the Mormons, some 12,000, were encamped on the Missouri, mainly at winter quarters, just north of what is now Omaha. Some were still in camps in western Iowa.

Back at Nauvoo, the remnant of the Mormons who had not been able to travel with the main group faced cruel persecutions, and finally on September 17, they were literally ejected from their city. The same day the gentiles took possession. These poor outcasts, some 650 in number, settled temporarily 2 miles above Montrose at a site appropriately called "poor camp," and there underwent the most severe privations. Grain was scarce, and frequently they pounded up the bark of the slippery elm tree and mixed it with their wheat for nourishment. They were in the direst poverty when rescued by a company of men returning from winter quarters.

Meanwhile the "saints" at the Missouri River were afflicted by an epidemic called "black canker." There was a drought; the streams entering into the Missouri were sluggish and like open sewers, one writer observes. Sickness spread through the camps and took a frightful toll. At a place called Papillion, one-third of the inhabitants were stricken at one time. It was a struggle to dig graves quickly enough for the burial of the dead.⁶

Finally, better weather arrived, and the general health of the people improved. The axes and saws were busy long hours felling trees and making logs for houses. A flour mill was built, and—most important—schools were established for the children, even in those primitive surroundings. There was order, industry, and a love of truth in their lives.

The new year, 1847, was welcomed by celebration, feasting, and a sense of expectancy. Now the Mormons looked forward to the final phase of their journey. On April 14, Brigham Young led a company of 143 able-bodied men, 3 women, and 2 children with 73 wagons to blaze the trail; to find their future home, their new Zion. The route was along the north branch of the Platte, and since it was early in the season, there was little grass. Frequently it was necessary to fell cottonwood trees for their horses and cattle to browse upon, and at times they fed grain to the animals. Buffalo were in great abundance, as were other game and fish; thus there was plenty of meat.

The order of the day was: up at 5 with the bugle call, breakfast, horses fed and teams hitched and ready to move at 7—20 miles a day when the going was good, and resting on the Sabbath. Early in June they reached the Black Hills where grass was abundant. Here they rested a few days and built ferryboats to cross the river. A large company bound for Oregon gladly paid the Mormons in provisions to ferry them across the river. Then came South Pass, and on westward skirting the Colorado desert and on to the Green River where they were

Footnotes at end of speech.

met by Samuel Brannan leading a group of Mormons up from California, they having sailed around the Horn from Brooklyn in 1846. On to Fort Bridger, July 5, and here that famous character Jim Bridger told them he would gladly pay \$1,000 for the first ear of corn raised in the Great Basin. July 12—the head of Echo Canyon was reached and realizing that the most difficult part of their journey lay ahead, Brigham Young dispatched a party of 43 men and 23 wagons and teams to move on as a vanguard, to make roads, build bridges up over the Wasatch Mountains and down into the valley of the Great Salt Lake.

This advance company, under Orson Pratt, was camped down almost to the mouth of Emigration Canyon July 20. On the 21st, Pratt and Erastus Snow crawled through the brush and scrub oak on their hands and knees, warned by the occasional rattle of a snake, up over the north side of the canyon entrance, onto the benchland and there beheld a mighty vista before them—the valley, and the lake shimmering in the distance. What emotion must have filled their breasts. "Hosanna, Hosanna to the Lord, Hosanna to the Creator of All," they cried. They went down into the valley, turned northward and reached the area which was later to become the business section of Salt Lake City. They returned to their brethren that evening and reported their findings. Next day seven men came down and made more extensive explorations. The following day, the 23d, the remainder of this advance group came into the valley, and started plowing and irrigating the land adjacent to a clear stream, the City Creek.

On July 24 Brigham Young and the main body of the pioneer band reached a point on Big Mountain, where the view of the valley was unbroken. President Young, who was ill with mountain fever, had the carriage in which he was reclining turned around so that he could see the valley. After gazing earnestly for several minutes (Wilford Woodruff tells us that President Young had already beheld the valley in a vision), he said, "It is enough, this is the right place; drive on." And so the pioneer band entered the Salt Lake Valley on July 24, the event which we now celebrate in this beautiful setting of Camp Marriott. They planted potatoes that afternoon.

The next day was Sunday and the pioneers held church service in their new Zion. It was recalled, by one of the speakers, that God had indeed blessed them for not one member of their group had died en route nor had any animal.

During the ensuing weeks 12 other companies arrived in the valley, the last one late in October. At the close of the year 1847, the population numbered 2,005,⁹ and already the fruits of teamwork and industry were evident. A village had sprung up; the beginning of a great city and the center of a great spiritual organization which was to cast its influence upon the nations was taking shape.

Of this great epic, Bancroft¹⁰ has written "There is no parallel in the world's history to this migration from Nauvoo. The exodus from Egypt was from a heathen land, a land of idolaters, to a fertile region designated by the Lord for his chosen people, the land of Canaan. The Pilgrim Fathers, in flying to America came from a bigoted and despotic people—a people making few pretensions to civil or religious liberty. It was from these same people who had fled from old world persecutions that they might enjoy their descendants and associates, that other of their descendants and associates, who claimed the right to differ from them in opinion and practice, were now fleeing."

Surely there is no parallel to this story. What a priceless heritage, what a magnificent legacy is ours.

Edmund Burke wrote, "Society is a great and silent compact between the dead, the living, and the unborn." Ours is indeed a choice society. May we always be worthy of it.

- ¹ "Essentials in Church History," p. 404, by Joseph Fielding Smith.
- ² Ibid., p. 402.
- ³ H. H. Bancroft, "History of Utah," p. 219.
- ⁴ Ibid., p. 220.
- ⁵ "Essentials of Church History," p. 406.
- ⁶ "History of Utah," p. 230.
- ⁷ "Bancroft," p. 248.
- ⁸ "Bancroft," p. 263.
- ⁹ "Essential of Church History," p. 461.
- ¹⁰ "Bancroft," p. 217.

standing public debt at specific periods within fiscal year 1962 as furnished to the Committee on Ways and Means by the Secretary of the Treasury last June. I call your attention to the fact that in evaluating this statistical table it should be remembered that this does not reflect the budgetary changes and additional spending proposed that have occurred since the middle of June.

The table follows:

Forecast of public debt outstanding, fiscal year 1962, based on constant operating cash balance of \$3,500,000,000 (excluding free gold)

[Based on assumed budget deficit of \$3,700,000,000]
[In billions]

	Operating balance, Federal Reserve banks and depositories (excluding free gold)	Public debt subject to limitation	Allowance to provide flexibility in financing and for contingencies	Total public debt limitation required ¹
1961				
June 30	\$3.5	\$286.4	\$3.0	\$289.4
July 15	3.5	288.6	3.0	291.6
July 31	3.5	289.6	3.0	292.6
Aug. 15	3.5	289.9	3.0	292.9
Aug. 31	3.5	290.1	3.0	290.1
Sept. 15	3.5	291.9	3.0	294.9
Sept. 30	3.5	288.2	3.0	291.2
Oct. 15	3.5	290.7	3.0	293.7
Oct. 31	3.5	292.2	3.0	295.2
Nov. 15	3.5	293.0	3.0	296.0
Nov. 30	3.5	292.8	3.0	295.8
Dec. 15	3.5	294.9	3.0	297.9
Dec. 31	3.5	292.4	3.0	295.4
1962				
Jan. 15	3.5	294.9	3.0	297.9
Jan. 31	3.5	294.0	3.0	297.0
Feb. 15	3.5	294.1	3.0	297.1
Feb. 28	3.5	293.2	3.0	296.2
Mar. 15	3.5	294.7	3.0	297.7
Mar. 31	3.5	291.2	3.0	294.2
Apr. 15	3.5	293.4	3.0	296.4
Apr. 30	3.5	292.7	3.0	295.7
May 15	3.5	292.9	3.0	294.9
May 31	3.5	291.3	3.0	295.3
June 15	3.5	293.6	3.0	296.6
June 30	3.5	290.1	3.0	293.1

¹ Assumes estimated budget revenues of \$81,400,000,000 and estimated expenditures of \$85,100,000,000.

² From July 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961, the statutory debt limit is \$293,000,000,000. Thereafter, but for this bill, it would revert to \$285,000,000,000.

³ Because the actual operating balance on June 30, 1961, is expected to be considerably larger than \$3,500,000,000, the public debt subject to limitation will be about \$289,000,000,000 on that date.

Source: U.S. Treasury Department.

Individualism and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 2, 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in these days, when the skies of liberty are black in many lands and seem darkened in our own, and when the President in his inaugural address called upon all Americans to see what they could do for their country rather than what the country can do for them, it is indeed both interesting and heartening to have presented

Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks I will include a table forecasting out-

in simple and understanding form a statement on individualism and freedom, what it is, and what it means in the way of rights and responsibilities.

From the town in which the "shot heard round the world" was fired in defense of individual liberty and freedom—a freedom from autocratic and bureaucratic control both from without and within—I present for the consideration of my colleagues an editorial from the Concord Free Press, of Concord, Mass.:

INDIVIDUALISM AND FREEDOM

The freedom which we enjoy as our heritage comes from the individualism of our forefathers whose independent natures were unable to tolerate the yoke of oppression and invasion of their sacred rights. This freedom which was won through great sacrifice and personal loss was safeguarded by a constitution whose purpose was to protect the people from the tyranny and indignity which are inevitable where freedom is dead.

It is revealing to note that all these far-seeing, strong-minded men had little use for the government other than as a bulwark against tyranny and relegated its functions to those which the people could not properly do for themselves. Thomas Jefferson warned against placing too much power in the hands of the government, and this philosophy was subscribed to as a more or less natural law by his fellow countrymen. Great individualists such as Ben Franklin cautioned against the evil of security and believed most vigorously that man's progress was more governed by its lack.

No where is this feeling of individuality better or more lucidly expressed than in the writings and life of Henry Thoreau. Although he lived in Concord more than 100 years ago, his philosophy lives on, and he is being remembered this week by the society formed 20 years ago in his honor.

Thoreau, the individualist, believed fervently that "that government is best which governs least." His disagreements with local authorities will bear this out. His ideal was unfettered freedom for man, his manuscript taken from the pages of natural law.

It would be well for us to hearken to the words of one who had little use for materialism and less for regimentation. He held that man was made to be more than good, "he must be good for something." The real good in man is brought out and stimulated where the reward is greatest. The reward is greatest where freedom is least restricted. Thoreau held that "there are thousands hacking at the branches of evil to every one at the root."

Paraphrasing him, we might say today that there are many hacking at the roots of freedom goaded by a misguided belief in the need for more government controls, while those whose purpose is to nurture this tree are more interested in gathering the fruit.

Tribute to Charles A. Swain, Vice President, Kiwanis International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR. OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 4, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, all New Jersey shares in the pride recently expressed by an editorial writer in Cape May at the news that Charles A. Swain of that community has

been elected this year as vice president of Kiwanis International.

Mr. Swain, a well-known businessman in his home town, has long been associated with good works and hard work. His fellow Kiwanians have chosen a man who will guide and help them meet the high standards of service that they have set for themselves.

Mr. President, an editorial from the July 13 edition of the Cape May Star and Wave expresses the high regard felt for Mr. Swain.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent to have the editorial entitled "Congratulations All Around," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS ALL AROUND

The election of Charles A. Swain, one of Cape May's leading businessmen for many years, as vice president of Kiwanis International last week is a very distinct honor in which the entire community may well take great pride.

While the news from the international convention in Canada came as no surprise because Kiwanians of New Jersey and many other States had been promoting his candidacy for some time as a sincere tribute for the tremendous contribution he has made through the years to the worldwide service organization, it was received in his hometown with more than the usual degree of satisfaction that accompanies the proverbial hometown-boy-makes-good story.

Any community, large or small, can well be proud when one of its citizens or a native son is accorded an important honor or wins public acclaim for some accomplishment. Election to the top echelon of an international organization, which by its very nature is concerned with putting into practice the high ideals and objectives of Kiwanis is doubly significant for a small community such as Cape May.

What makes it still more gratifying to his friends and neighbors who know how he has dedicated so much of his time and effort to the service organization is that we have watched him, man and boy, pursuing and promoting the most commendable principles and objectives of organizations and movements in which he has earned the distinction of leadership.

Starting in early boyhood with a greater than average interest in Boy Scouting, Nick worked his way to the top to become not only one of the first Eagle Scouts in this section but a moving force in scouting over a period of years.

In his family life and in his business career as well as in the civic, fraternal, and religious life of the community, his has been a record of service above and beyond the call of duty. So it has been with his interest in Kiwanis which has taken him from youthful membership in the local club through all or nearly all of its offices, on to the district and State levels and up the ladder through a term as an international trustee and now as vice president of the worldwide organization.

But beyond the dedication, drive, and enthusiasm which have carried him to positions of honor and leadership in his chosen fields, we who have known Nick through the years have gained far more than gratification from his successes. Many of us and the community at large have benefited in many ways from his day-to-day practice of the high ideals and principles promoted by the organizations and movements in which he has taken a leading part.

We join his many other friends and fellow townsmen in congratulating Nick Swain on his most recent honor, in congratulating Kiwanis International for according such well-deserved recognition, and in congratulating ourselves for having one of our hometown boys achieve such a position of eminence among a topflight group of the world's business and professional men drawn together by strong bonds of high purpose, high principle, and a strong desire to be of service to their fellow men.

No Change in Soviet Objective of World Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the ultimate goal of the Communists never changes. Their final objective is to rule the world and every move made by the Kremlin is designed to reach that objective. One of the principle strategies of the Reds is to know when to retreat or to seem to change direction. The recently announced new program of the Soviet Union is merely another tactical move in the long cold war which they expect to win. In this connection I would like to call your attention to an analysis of the newest Communist plan which appeared in an editorial in the Dallas Times Herald in Dallas, Tex.:

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Aug. 1, 1961]

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE PLAN—SAME OLD SONG, ANOTHER VERSE

The Soviet switch to a policy of "peaceful coexistence" should come as a surprise to nobody.

The Communists have had no change of heart. They are no less committed to world conquest and world domination now than at any time in the past.

This is a tactical rather than a strategic move.

Unfortunately, though, there are many well-meaning but uninformed Americans who are so anxious to avoid war or so anxious to read into the Reds' conduct some good intentions that they will be deceived by the announcement of a policy change.

It must be remembered that all Communists effort is aimed at furthering the Communist cause. War, peace offensives, subversion, guerrilla warfare, propaganda, economic pressure and negotiation are all weapons or tactics to be employed in what the Reds call "the struggle." The weapon or tactic employed is merely the one believed best for a particular job at a particular time.

Furthermore, there is considerable variation in meaning of terms between Communists and free worlds.

Peaceful coexistence to the average American—or the average citizen of any free nation—means merely live-and-let-live.

To the Communist it means the existence of both Communist and other states without overt warfare as long as they live on Communist terms.

That is the "Leninist principle of peaceful coexistence" which the Soviet people are ordered to support.

The party promises that free housing and free transportation are only a decade away but at the same time hedges by saying that